

THE
REFORMED QUARTERLY REVIEW

NO. 3.—JULY, 1894.

I.

OUR ZION'S REJOICING.*

BY REV. J. H. DUBBS, D. D.

PSALMS 48: 12-14. "Walk about Zion and go round about her: tell the towers thereof. Mark ye well her bulwarks, consider her palaces, that ye may tell it to the generation following. For this God is our God forever and ever; he will be our guide even unto death."

It was a day of supreme rejoicing when the Psalmist addressed the words of our text to the assembled multitudes of Israel. The people had come from distant regions to return thanks for the signal mercies of Jehovah, who, in a season of national danger, had so securely guarded the mountain of His holiness that not one of its towers had been battered down nor one of its bulwarks broken. To the people of Israel this was the abundant cause of universal rejoicing. Zion was to them the recognized type, the acknowledged centre of the theocracy; it might almost have been termed the axis around which the church and state revolved. Therefore, they burst forth in loud

* A Sermon preached at the Consecration of the new building of the Theological Seminary of the Reformed Church at Lancaster, Penna., May 10, 1894.

songs of rejoicing, and their hearts beat with responsive rapture, when in splendid strains of inspired poetry they were bidden to walk about the holy place—to count the towers, to see for themselves that not a single defense was lost; so that when they returned to their scattered homes, and the rising generation gathered round them—whether in city home or desert tent—they might from the rich sources of their personal experience relate the story of the never-ceasing mercy of their fathers' God.

Between festivals so widely separated by time and space a close analogy can hardly exist; but is there not a certain suggestiveness in the text as applied to the present auspicious occasion? Zion, it is true, is no longer localized. Wherever God's word is preached in its purity and the sacraments administered according to the terms of their institution, there is Zion—there God dwells. Yet there is a generic unity in religious rejoicing in all lands and nations; and as we gather this day to consecrate to Jehovah's service this beautiful structure, which by its very nature must concentrate the warmest affections of our Reformed Zion, as we feel that there are thousands of hearts all over the land that beat responsively with ours—the image of ancient Zion rises to our vision, and we join the multitudes that thronged her courts and united in songs of rejoicing when they beheld her mighty bulwarks and magnificent palaces.

On such an occasion as the present every object which we behold—every emotion that thrills the heart—points to a single theme. This is not a season for mourning over past neglect or present imperfections. *Sursum corda!* Let the season supply the theme—the brightest, the happiest, we can conceive—while we contemplate

OUR ZION'S REJOICING.

While thus in rapture we gaze upon the river whose streams make glad the city of our God, is it not well to trace the fountains that have united to swell the generous flood?

I. OUR ZION'S REJOICING IS THE FRUIT OF GENUINE HISTORICAL DEVELOPMENT.

Half a century ago the great Dr. John W. Nevin said: "Have faith in history, for without it you can have no faith in the world, no faith in yourselves, no faith in God." Nowhere in the world has this truth been more constantly inculcated than in these institutions, and nowhere has it been more completely illustrated than in the grand revealings of the purposes of God in their historic development.

The beginnings of this wonderful process must be sought in distant lands. The Reformed Church in the United States is, as we all know, in a special sense the American representative of the Reformed Church of Switzerland and Germany, the oldest of that series of national churches that springs from the great religious movement of the sixteenth century of which Zwingli, Calvin and Ursinus were distinguished exponents. In its early history its chief centres of influence were Zurich, Geneva and Heidelberg. It was at Heidelberg, under the patronage of Frederick III, the pious Elector, that "the three-fold cord" was twined, and we have always been glad to be known as "the Church of the Heidelberg Catechism."

A living germ involves all the possibilities of a fully developed organism. We are, therefore, not surprised to behold at the very beginning certain characteristics which have distinguished our branch of the Reformed Church through all the ages of its subsequent development. Can any one, for instance, call into question its peculiarly Christologic character? Surely, it was not by a mere coincidence that the earliest important Reformed Synod, held in Berne in 1532, laid down as the fundamental canon of doctrine the truth that "Christ is the centre of Christian teaching" and that "God Himself can be known only as He has revealed Himself in Jesus Christ." Nor was it without due consideration that, in the days when theologians were chiefly concerned with the interpretation of God's decrees, the great Bullinger, the successor of Zwingli at Zurich, ap-

pealed to the Reformed Churches to remember that "Christ Himself is the contents of Divine Predestination."

It is this central truth which in the Heidelberg Catechism is the sun around which each lesser star revolves. It is still, as it has always been, in a special sense the foundation of Reformed doctrine. As the validity of our legislative enactments depends upon their harmonious agreement with the Constitution of the United States, so it is by this touchstone that all our theological and literary teaching must finally be tested. Any lecture, or sermon, or book, that contradicts or ignores this central truth, whatever else it may be, is not Reformed.

A fixed position at the centre allows liberty of movement at the circumference. It was the Christological principle, we hold, that from the beginning rendered the Reformed Church in a peculiar sense the church of union and of freedom. It enabled it to preserve its essential unity under conditions the most diverse; it allowed it to cherish schools of theology by scores without diverting the current of its inner life. Was not that a wonderful historic movement which, without sacrificing its identity, could take up in its onward sweep such widely differing communities as the Waldenses, at Angrogna, and the Hussites, at Sendomir? Concerning this subject Ebrard has well said: "We have always regarded it as really Reformed to be sincerely favorable to union: that is, to accept everything in other confessions that has been proved to us to be true and in accordance with the Scriptures. Above all we rejoice to have given a safe refuge and the rights of citizenship to the disciples of Melanchthon who were elsewhere persecuted."

In this way the Reformed Church of the continent of Europe acquired its truly catholic character. Enriched by many precious streams of Christian life it not only remained the church of the martyrs, but became the herald of liberty—the church which gave birth to the champions of freedom who in many lands proclaimed and defended the rights of man—the church which in the person of the great Elector of Brandenburg was the first to declare universal liberty of conscience.

No other church, we venture to say, has held more firmly to its fundamental principle; no other church has more freely expressed its faith in the organic unity of the Church of Christ; no other church has more gladly welcomed the revealings of history in the liberation of the nations.

It was but a little branch of the parent vine that our fathers bore across the sea. Transplanted to uncongenial soil it was long before it was known whether it would live or die; but, thank God! we this day gather a few of its ripened clusters.

Do we fully appreciate the difficulties that encompassed the pioneers in the work of establishing the German Reformed Church in this country? The English churches had been founded in the preceding century; they had been trained to self-reliance and comparative liberality; they had produced men whose names still live in history, long before Boehm and Weiss and Goetschius, about the close of the first quarter of the eighteenth century, began their humble labors among the scattered Palatines of Pennsylvania. Our forefathers were mostly poor people, though possibly, as Stilling says, "Many of them are now high nobility in heaven." They came from widely separated regions, and brought with them local prejudices and various shades of doctrine. That in all their trials they were sustained by a profound religious consciousness cannot be doubted; but they had lived under a state church and could hardly conceive the idea of ecclesiastical self-government. Unfamiliar with the language of this country they were slow to adopt the practical methods of their neighbors; and even the learned pastors who were sent to them from the fatherland were in this respect hardly qualified to become their instructors.

We appreciate the kindness that was shown to our fathers by the churches of the fatherland and especially by the synods of Holland. We are deeply grateful for the blessings that rested on the work of Schlatter and his coadjutors; but after all this was the period of the planting when much of the laborer's toil is hidden from our view. O, that during the long period of the *Coetus* the "fathers" in Europe, instead of distributing an

annual stipend among the pastors of established charges, had seen their way clear to aid them in founding a literary and theological institution ! That instead of forbidding the American churches to administer the rite of ordination, they had encouraged them to prepare young men for the ministry and to send them forth to occupy the land !

In spite of all these obstacles there can be no doubt that the Reformed Church of the colonial period developed in normal historic lines. There were great controversies which are now forgotten, and one sect after the other separated from the parent stem ; but the church as a whole remained faithful to the truth which had been committed to its charge. The development was slow, but it stood in intimate relation with the past—it looked forward to a grander purpose in the future.

We do not underestimate the importance of the period which immediately succeeded the organization of our earliest synod, whose centennial anniversary we have so recently commemorated. It has been described as a season of disintegration ; but statistics prove that in certain directions there was genuine advancement. Pastors felt free to prepare young men for the work of the ministry, and in this way many vacant charges were at last supplied with the means of grace. Some of the older pastors were instructors of no common order ; but their students had come to them without proper preparation, and they themselves were burdened with parochial labor. In some instances, it must be confessed, the student's work consisted chiefly in reading Stapfer or Mursina and in preaching in the outlying congregations of his preceptor. Is it not evident that under such circumstances the training of the ministry was entirely inadequate ? Men of extraordinary talent, it is true, rose, by unceasing industry, above their unfavorable surroundings ; but these were the men who were most ready to confess their deficiencies and to long for better things. Can we wonder that important charges called to the pastorate ministers from other denominations who failed to comprehend the spirit of the Reformed Church ; and that some of our oldest churches, espe-

cially in New York, New Jersey and the South, were permanently alienated from the faith of their fathers. Even among the ministers who stood in the same historic life, we know, there were many disagreements. They had been differently trained and varied greatly in faith and practice.

The founding of the Theological Seminary, at Carlisle, in 1825, was the most important event in the history of the Reformed Church in the United States. That it was effected in the face of stupendous difficulties we need not say. Its necessity not only failed to be recognized by a large part of the Church, but it met with bitter opposition. Conventions were held and books written to denounce it, and the opposition finally resulted in a serious schism. It might, surely, have been said of the founders of the Seminary that "they built with one hand and with the other held a weapon." That in this controversy, as in those of later date, errors were committed on both sides we shall not presume to deny. Here we see in part and we know in part, and no man can claim exemption from the imperfections of his nature. It is, however, pleasant to remember that the early opponents of the Seminary subsequently freely confessed that in its establishment the Church had been faithful to her historic antecedents; and that some of them became in days of trial its most enthusiastic defenders.

This is not the occasion to relate the history of this institution with all its trials and triumphs. It would indeed reveal the names of men and women whose faith never wavered; whose self-sacrificing devotion deserves to be forever remembered. On themes so comprehensive we must not dwell; but there is special appropriateness in recalling that marvellous episode during which, in the hour of sore extremity, we appealed once more to the fraternal affection of the fatherland. James Reily was a plain American pastor; but his mission to Europe, in 1825, was crowned with wonderful success. It was through his influence that the King of Prussia became a liberal contributor to the infant institution. Some of the books in our library,

we know, are stamped with the arms of the House of Hohenzollern. It was this mission and its results that encouraged the hearts of our fathers in the darkest days in the history of this institution, and on its roll of honor the name of James Reily deserves a place among the foremost.

For many years the external condition of our Theological Seminary was humble, and yet, strangely enough, it was known through all the land. Its teachers might readily have claimed exemption from taking part in the discussion of questions which extended far beyond the limits of their immediate sphere of labor; but as we study the chronicles of the period we are more and more convinced that for profound scholarship, intellectual force, and dignity of character, they held a place among the foremost theologians of their age. Time would fail us to tell how the professors of the Seminary and College toiled for the class-room and for the press; how they brought from the fatherland the richest products of Christian thought; how above all things they taught those who were within the sphere of their influence to study exalted themes—to think profoundly on subjects of which before they had hardly dreamed. We have surely not forgotten that Rauch was, in this country, the first to publish an important treatise on the profound and fascinating science of Psychology; that Nevin wrote "A Plea for Philosophy," and that Schaff began his historic labors by directing the attention of American students to "The Principle of Protestantism" and by preparing an exhaustive monograph in answer to the question: "What is Church History?"

All this, it must be confessed, was glorious work. If it was no more, it was, at least, an exemplification of what Lanfranc called "the art of making a small people great." Yet, in contemplating the upbuilding of our Zion we may be permitted to tell some of the towers, to mark a few of the bulwarks in which we now rejoice.

There was, in those days, a full expression of confidence in the historic life of the Church. At the time of the founding of the Theological Seminary and of Marshall College, the country

was swept by a wave of religious enthusiasm, which, whatever may have been its excellence under other conditions, had proved itself utterly foreign to the life of the Reformed Church. Its influence was disintegrating, and it had already led to a threatening division. Then the publication of a little book, "The Anxious Bench," stemmed the tide in other churches as well as in our own, and the people learned to comprehend and to value their ancient system of religious instruction.

Another important characteristic of this period was the presentation of exalted ideals. Christians were directed to find these ideals in the development of the Church. History was taught as it had in this country never before been taught, not only as a record of past events, but as the outward flow of a divine life revealing itself in the procession of the ages. Men seemed to behold anew the heroes of the faith, delineated with all the fire and energy of genius. One by one the mystic visitors were questioned concerning their message to a later generation. Now it was Nevin who, in his "Mystical Presence," called upon John Calvin to testify concerning the highest mysteries of our faith; then it was Schaff who, amid difficulties of which we can hardly form a proper conception, published in Mercersburg the first volume of his "History of the Church;" a work which, in the Congratulatory Address to its author by the University of Berlin, in 1893, is termed "the most notable monument of universal historical learning produced by the School of Neander." The narrower field of our own immediate history was, in the meantime, by no means neglected. A little earlier Dr. Lewis Mayer, with immense labor, gathered the materials of our early history, and had begun on a large scale a "History of the Reformed Church," of which, unfortunately, a preliminary volume has alone been published. A few years later Dr. Henry Harbaugh undertook the minute researches which resulted in the publication of the "Lives of the Fathers of the Reformed Church," a marvellous work when we consider the difficulties under which it was accomplished. All this may, however, be regarded as preliminary to the work of the pastors who in

countless monographs related the history of their Classes and congregations.

It was, indeed, a time of wonderful literary activity, when thoughts came pressing into the mind and left the recipient no rest until he had set them down in print. Was not the simultaneous publication in a little mountain village of two such periodicals as the MERCERSBURG REVIEW and the *Deutsche Kirchenfreund* an undertaking of almost heroic boldness? Yet who can measure the extent of the influence which was thus exerted—who can number the brilliant minds which were thus trained to those habits of theological research and literary activity which, we venture to say, are still characteristic of their successors? Who can recall the glorious ideals whose contemplation lifted up our people to a higher plane of thinking and being? Is it not an inspiring reflection that the old REVIEW, with title slightly changed, is still regularly published, and that all the professors and many of the alumni of these institutions have in its pages discussed the grandest themes in theologic and philosophic science?

It was not my privilege to be a student in the days when Dr. John W. Nevin's powerful articles began to attract attention to the school at Mercersburg; my recollections are of a more quiet time, when, after the removal of the college to Lancaster, a little company gathered at Mercersburg in half-deserted halls to listen to the eloquence of Dr. Schaff and the practical wisdom of Dr. Wolff; but, after all, the echoes of the earlier period were still heard, and it was easy to gain a consistent idea of its general character. Looking back now over all the intervening years, I see no reason to modify my early impression that it was one of the most remarkable epochs in the history of the Church. It was a time when, in Europe and America, strong men were striving with great thoughts; when, perhaps, in the feeble light vouchsafed them at the dawning of a new era, minor objects were sometimes magnified beyond their due proportions; but it cannot be doubted that lofty souls were struggling towards a higher light. To some of their hearers

the message of these men appeared a marvellous revelation; to others it seemed a deceptive mirage; but whatever may have been their attitude, their minds were elevated by the study of lofty themes—their aspirations extended by a vision of exalted ideals.

Let it also be remembered that during its entire history it has been the purpose of our Theological Seminary—its teachers and pupils—to do honor to our ancient standard of faith, the Heidelberg Catechism. No other company of men, we make bold to say, has in the present century done so much to revive the authority of that precious symbol. What a long series of literary tributes it has called forth, beginning, perhaps, in 1847 with Dr. Nevin's "History of the Heidelberg Catechism," and culminating, in 1863, in the publication of a Tercentenary edition in three languages, the most splendid presentation of that great work that ever left the press! On this subject the professors dwelt with delight, and the alumni produced works of enduring merit. Among the latter an exalted place must be accorded to the great *Commentary on the Heidelberg Catechism*, by Zacharias Ursinus, translated from the Latin by the Rev. Dr. George W. Williard.

The most vigorous branches of the tree of life are adorned by the blossoms of Christian poetry. It was in the normal order that faith and devotion should break forth in song. The hymns of Harbaugh and Higbee were not sporadic effusions; they were the genuine blooming of that truth which their authors believed and taught. Therefore in the ages to come they shall continue to bloom in unfading beauty forever.

On recent days we have no time to dwell. In every line of literary activity there have been constant labor and commensurate progress. With these facts all may be presumed to be familiar. There is, however, special appropriateness, on such an occasion as the present, in the grateful recognition of the fact that one, at least, of the men who were most prominent in the history of our literary development has been spared to complete the crowning labor of his long career. In his monumental

work, "The Institutes of the Christian Religion," which is now in course of publication, the Rev. Dr. E. V. Gerhart has enjoyed the rare privilege of personally distributing the treasures of truth which he gathered in days that are past—of telling to a following generation the precious story of the faithfulness of their fathers' God.

There is a certain pleasure in suffering the mind to dwell on the events we have ventured to enumerate, though they may justly be regarded as mere fragments of a greater history; but are they not, after all, chiefly precious because they reveal an underlying Christologic principle, because they declare more clearly than words can speak the truth that our present rejoicing is the fruit of genuine historical development?

II.—OUR ZION'S REJOICING IS THE PLEDGE OF PRESENT OBLIGATION.

Where there is no recognition of the authority of the past there can be no sense of real responsibility. This institution, with all that it involves, is a sacred trust which must be exercised in the full consciousness of its profound solemnity. We stand in vital union with the life of the past, and if we were separated from it we should wither like a branch that is abruptly cut away from the parent stem. If this institution did not bear with it the life, and spirit, and substance of that branch of the Church of Christ, which it especially represents, it would be unworthy of confidence and respect. Standing as our fathers did in the central truth of the incarnate God, we shall be as ready as they were to become the heralds of liberty. "Ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free."

We must also have confidence in the principle of progress—we must go forth with stalwart hearts to meet the issues of the present day.

There is a conservatism which is discreditable; a clinging to the past with a tenacity which admits of no advancement. It is, no doubt, a comfortable position; it involves none of the strain and pressure, and even personal danger that accompanies

those who take part in the conflict. No doubt it is, in a certain sense, safest to imagine that every possible problem has been solved by our fathers—to confine all thought and life to a traditional form—to close our ears to the sound of the conflict that rages without the gate. Yet is it right—is it the part of Christian courage—to refuse to lend our strength in the hour of trial to the cause which we believe to be true?

The Theological Seminary of the Reformed Church and Franklin and Marshall College—we do not hesitate to say—have not been established to serve the purpose of any false conservatism. They will never, we trust, be satisfied to rest in unhistorical stagnation. Their trumpet must not give an uncertain sound when the hosts of the Lord prepare themselves for the battle.

The Church of this generation is exposed to dangers which are not less threatening than those of former years, though they may possibly be more refined and insidious. That we are living in a period of religious and social transition will hardly be doubted by any earnest student of history. The questions which now present themselves to the thoughtful mind are not those which confronted our predecessors; and to answer them must tax the powers of the most commanding intellect. We cannot ignore these questions; we dare not in honesty make light of them; we must study them with all the eagerness of neophytes—with all the earnestness of servants of our Lord. But, O, how much labor it will involve! How many misunderstandings it may entail! How many conflicts it must provoke!

To be a teacher—a student—in these days imposes heavy duties and vast responsibilities; but it also brings with it high opportunities and glorious privileges. We may sometimes tremble for Zion; but we are strengthened by the assurance that—"This God is our God forever and ever; He will be our guide even unto death." We need above all things to cultivate a spirit of self-sacrificing devotion. From every direction comes a call to high and holy activity. There never was a time when the mission of the Reformed Church was so clear; there never

was a period when its opportunities of usefulness were more extended. New fields are opening everywhere, and "the destinies of the world are in the hands of those who work." But what we need more than scholarship—more than unceasing toil—is complete consecration of the mind and soul. This splendid building, the willing sacrifice of thousands of faithful hearts, is this day consecrated to the service of the triune God. This is not a mere formality; for God is no formalist. That which is dedicated to His service He will accept; and His spirit will dwell within these walls, not as an intermittent influence, but as a constant, living, personal presence. Let all who labor here—all who go forth to preach the blessed Gospel—live in the power of that glorious presence; for there is an important sense in which every soul that is duly prepared becomes the subject of divine inspiration. Dr. Schaff was fond of saying to his students: "Study every sermon on your knees as well as with the pen." This is the noblest obligation of all—the ultimate condition of glorious success.

III. ZION'S REJOICING IS THE EARNEST OF FUTURE BLESSINGS.

There must be no disposition to rest satisfied with present achievements. These imposing buildings, with all that they involve and include, rejoice the hearts of all who have waited for them so longingly and yet so hopefully. Is it to be wondered at if, when we walk around this structure, so beautiful in all its parts, so admirably suited to its intended purpose, we should exclaim, in rapturous admiration, "How amiable are thy tabernacles, O Lord of Hosts!" "I had rather be a doorkeeper in the house of my God than to dwell in the tents of wickedness." Yet, after all, we feel that this is but a foretaste of a more glorious banquet. The veil that hides the future may not be withdrawn; but it cannot entirely conceal the glory that shines beyond. The sweetest melodies may not be heard; but we may at least accept the prophetic promise: "All thy chil-

dren shall be taught of the Lord, and great shall be the peace of thy children."

The teaching of this institution is for the Lord, from the Lord, and in the Lord. Its message is peace, enduring peace, consistent peace—grateful to earth and fragrant to heaven. On this day—the brightest in its history—this ancient institution sends forth its greetings to all its children, scattered far and wide. It rejoices in the work they have done—in the institutions they have founded. It invites their responsive sympathy—their cordial coöperation in the work of the Lord. May the day soon come when all the members of the Reformed Church shall feel that they have here a home where a cordial welcome awaits them—when, as they gather from every Christian brotherhood within our borders, they may experience rejoicing more profound, more all-embracing, than that which filled the hearts of the children of Israel when they assembled in the courts of Zion!

As the years roll on, the principle on which this institution is founded will be more fully revealed. In the freedom of the truth it will, we trust, be a potent factor in the advancement of the kingdom of God. Faithful to its historic position, it will welcome the good in all its forms, and cordially recognize the organic unity of the Church of Christ. By its progress it will prepare the way for that eternal unity for which we have so earnestly longed, and which will appear at last as the final revelation of the life of Christ in the world.

As we gather this day in the courts of Zion, we know that our rejoicing is shared by a multitude which no man can number. The glorious company of the apostles, the goodly fellowship of the prophets, the noble army of martyrs—yea, even the holy Church throughout the world—all are partakers in this act of solemn consecration. The faithful servants of the Church in former generations, the earnest pioneers, the self-sacrificing men and women who founded this institution, the beloved teachers—Mayer, and Rauch, and Nevin, and Schaff, and Wolff, and Harbaugh, and Higbee—even multitudes of glorified spirits—can

we doubt that they all rejoice to see our day? For do we not believe in the communion of saints? In such a presence obligations seem light and hope grows stronger. Therefore, we join with God's saints in the song of the Cherubim and Seraphim. Therefore, in the fulness of our thanksgiving, we unite in the ancient collect: "Enable us, O Lord, to follow their faith, that we may enter at death into their joy; and so abide with them in rest and peace till both they and we shall reach our common consummation of redemption and bliss in the glorious resurrection of the last day."

II.

THE INFLUENCE OF THE REFORMED CHURCH ON CIVIL GOVERNMENT.*

BY GEORGE F. BAER, ESQ., LL.D.

A GREAT historian says: "The germ of the Constitutional liberties of modern times lay hid in the bosom of the Reformation." He could have added, with equal historic truth, that the Reformed Church was the principal factor in the development of this germ. Of course, by the Reformed Church, I mean the Church known in history by that name, eliminating modifications in organization caused, and perhaps necessarily, by differences in language, national habit and locality.

The Reformation did not start as an organized movement. It was the outcome of ages of misrule and oppression. The people everywhere were dissatisfied with the existing order of things. The leaders did not originate; they simply formulated the grievances, gave expression to the longings of the masses, proclaimed that which had been slumbering, and which only awaited a voice to give it utterance—a voice that would at once be recognized as the voice of the people.

The revolt was general; but, when the attempt was made to organize and combine it into one organic union, formidable obstacles were encountered. The common view is that the unification of Protestantism was prevented by a disagreement about theological dogmas. To some extent this is true. What we now regard as an unseemly controversy over "*hoc est corpus*

* Delivered at the banquet preceding the dedication of the new Theological Seminary Buildings at Lancaster, Pa., on May 10, 1894.

meum" was a factor in preventing the union of Protestantism in the sixteenth century; but I do not think that a critical examination of the history of the times shows this to have been the controlling factor. The differences between the two great forces of the Reformation, which are known by the names Lutheran and Reformed, were more organic and much wider and deeper; they were differences in the spirit, scope and purpose of the revolution in which they were engaged. To some extent the division was geographical. That which we know as the Lutheran movement had its centre in Saxony, and embraced the neighboring provinces as far south as the Rhine. It had the powerful support of the Elector of Saxony and many of the German electors and princes. From first to last it aimed only to reform the Church. The reformation of the State was not thought of. The Reformed movement was most general in the countries south of the Rhine—that is, in Switzerland, France, some of the Rhine provinces, and the Netherlands. When these people revolted against Rome, they not only revolted against the spiritual abuses of the Church, but against the intolerable civil rule that everywhere had been forced upon them. They could not see how a reformation of religion could be brought about without reforming the civil power by which the tyranny and corruptions of religion were upheld. Church and State, Pope and Emperor, Bishop and Baron, were but different names of a mighty and all-powerful combination that everywhere oppressed the people. In other words, the Reformed leaders sought to reform Church and State.

The conditions in the north and south of Europe were essentially different. In the south, the power of mediæval feudalism was already broken. The revival of learning in Italy had restored to the world the classic literature of Greece and Rome. Men's imaginations were inflamed by the glories of the Grecian republics, and their anger aroused by the cruel debauchery of the Borgia popes. They found the Old and New Testaments full of fierce denunciations against bad kings and false priests. The route of travel and trade from the Adriatic to the cities of

the Hanseatic league was the route of news, intelligence and communication. It developed many free cities to which special privileges were granted. These cities were miniature republics, generally clothed with full local autonomy; their citizens were tenacious of their privileges, and possessed a larger degree of freedom than the masses. Switzerland was a confederation of little republics. In the very beginning the Swiss reformers became the leaders of the Reformed movement. They had tasted liberty and longed for more of it. These differences in scope and purpose were clearly developed at the Marburg Conference. You remember it was called to effect a union of Protestantism. The controversy between the Saxon and Swiss reformers over the Eucharist was sharp and bitter. In the end some sort of compromise was reached. It was not satisfactory; compromises seldom are. The conference, however, broke up without accomplishing the union of Switzerland and Saxony in a common defence of Protestantism against the assaults of Rome. Why? Obviously because the Saxon reformers saw that the Swiss movement involved more than a mere reformation of the Church. Luther's remark to Zwingli: "You are not of the same spirit," is often quoted and generally applied to theological differences. This is a misapplication. What Luther meant by a different spirit is clearly disclosed by a remark of Jonas, one of his colleagues: "When," said he to Zwingli, "you have reformed the hats of the peasants you will claim to reform the sable caps of princes." This spirit of liberty was strong in Zwingli. He held that political freedom was a Christian duty. It was this spirit that offended the Saxon reformers.

At a subsequent period, when the treaty known as the Recess of Augsburg was made, as a result of the victory of the Protestant forces under the leadership of Maurice of Saxony over Charles the Fifth, the Pope and Emperor were careful to confine the benefits of peace to Catholics and to such as adhered to the Confession of Augsburg. The rigor of the laws against heretics was left in force as to the Reformed people. Indeed, it was not until the end of the Thirty Years' War that the ban

against them was removed. The Treaty of Westphalia provided that the Reformed should enjoy, in as ample manner as the Lutherans, all advantages and protection which the Recess of Augsburg (made one hundred years before) afforded.

This exclusion of the Reformed from the benefits of the Treaty of Augsburg is the key-note to an understanding of much subsequent history. Emperor and Pope fully understood this spirit of the Reformed (people). They knew that with them reformation of the Church involved the reformation of civil government, whilst those who adhered to the Confession of Augsburg at that time desired only religious liberty. This difference runs, like the theme of an opera, through the whole story of the Reformation. Napoleon understood it. Speaking of the rivalry between Francis the First and Charles the Fifth, he said that Francis the First might have made himself the great hero of the Reformation had he turned Protestant; but, he cautiously added, he could not have adopted the Reformed faith, which was altogether Republican, and led to the overthrow of monarchy.

The adherents of the Confession of Augsburg, having been pacified by the Augsburg Recess, the Pope and Emperor were left free to exterminate heresy in the Netherlands. The whole power of Spain and Rome was concentrated to crush the Reformation in the Netherlands. In vain did the Dutch implore the Protestants of Germany to come over and help them. Saint Aldegonde, with the clear vision of a seer, told them at Worms that if they did not help to fight the battles of Protestantism in the lowlands of Holland, the day would come when in fiercer form the conflict would be brought to a finish on the plains of Germany. The Thirty Years' War, with its devastation and depopulation of Germany, was the price paid for deserting the Dutch. There is no more pitiable spectacle in history than that of Protestant Germany (with the exception of a few personal followers of William the Silent) standing aloof, protected in religion and property by a selfish treaty, whilst the whole might and power of Spain and Catholicism

were concentrated to crush the Protestants in the Netherlands. How much the cause of religious and civil liberty owes to William the Silent! Born a Lutheran, trained a Catholic in the service of the Emperor, he espoused the cause of liberty. As the struggle for liberty and just laws went on, he saw that in the Reformed phase of Protestantism lay the true hopes of freedom. In the hour of greatest struggle he joined the Reformed Church, and led the hosts of Protestantism to victory. A victory that gave, not alone freedom to the Netherlands, but set the example of religious toleration for the whole world. The religious and civil liberty we this day possess grew out of this heroic struggle in the Netherlands.

Switzerland, from a confederation of aristocratic republics, under Reformed influences, has developed into the most democratic of all nations.

Whence come the liberties of England? From the great charter? Magna Charta is among the brightest epochs in history. Its story will never grow old. It will always be the fruitful theme of oratory. Still one smiles at times to hear Americans of Teutonic descent tell how our English ancestors—barons, too, they were—with mailed hand extorted the great charter of our liberties from King John at Runnymede. But Magna Charta was dull parchment—dead and dry as the bones in Ezekiel's vision—until those stern Calvinists in the era of the Commonwealth put life and spirit into the musty old parchment; and even then the life was fitful and the spirit tame until a Reformed Prince, William of Orange, ascended the throne of England. The English call his accession the revolution. Such it undoubtedly was. The limitations on monarchical power, and what is now called English constitutional liberty, date from the landing of William of Orange, a descendant of the great William the Silent, on English soil.

I intended to tell you of our own freedom, and from whence it comes. Time will not permit.

Will you turn to France? The seed of civil and religious liberty was sown there by the Reformed Protestants early in

the sixteenth century. It was soon choked by corruption and blood. From time to time it sprouted into new life and gave promise of glorious things—again to be cut down by remorseless tyranny and persecution. Cut down, but never uprooted. In our generation, we have seen it develop new life and vigorous growth with hopeful promise of becoming a full-grown tree of liberty, under whose shade her people may find rest. Turn where you will, and this fact confronts you—wherever the Reformed faith has become a controlling factor in the life of nations, then has followed, as the day follows the night, the death of absolutism, and a new birth of freedom.

Religious and civil liberty and education are inseparable. The true votary of freedom must ever be the generous patron of learning. There is no more pleasing incident in history than that which tells how the Reformed people of the Netherlands, as a thank-offering for the deliverance from the Spanish siege of Leyden, founded the famous University of Leyden. Well may we, who enjoy the blessings of civil and religious liberty in a fuller and more permanent form than ever fell to the Reformed people of Holland, imitate their example, and build schools and colleges as a thank-offering for the greater blessings of civil and religious liberty which, after ages of toil and struggle, have been vouchsafed to us.

We are here to-day to dedicate this school of the prophets. May it teach a theology pure, broad and tolerant, whose ultimate test of orthodoxy shall be conformity to that first and great commandment: "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind;" and a sociology whose fundamental, central and crowning principles shall be founded on that other commandment: "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself," "for on these two commandments hang all the law and the prophets."

III.

THE POSITION OF THE EPISCOPAL CHURCH WITH REFERENCE TO CATHOLIC UNITY.

BY REV. J. W. SANTEE, D. D., CAVETOWN, MD.

ANY careful reader of the New Testament, and with some conception of what "the Church" is, feels that the divided interest of our Protestantism is unsatisfactory and contrary to the prayer of the Lord. (John 17: 21.) But how to remedy "these disorders and heal her divisions," for which the sincere Christian prays, is the great question. It is so contrary to reason and common sense, that from the days of the Reformation on, efforts were made to preserve the unity of the "Body of Christ" and save it from disruption. All the efforts, made in that early day, however, proved to be vain, and the door was opened for division. How long has not the Church, in her collects, prayed, "heal her divisions;" but so far unity has not been restored, and that day seems to be as far off as ever. Of late, special efforts have been made, propositions submitted, especially by the Episcopal branch of the Church, looking towards a closer union between the different denominations and sects, but any one reading the sentiments expressed by different bishops in the Episcopal Church, as well as leading ministers in other branches, must see and feel that there is more sound in these expressions towards unity, than reality. The idea of union seems to be a pleasant one; but when it comes to the test, when the idea is to be realized, no basis is offered whereon to effect it, not even federative, much less organic. As it now stands every denomination is for itself, and instead of harmony there is a continual friction, each one endeavoring to outstrip

the other. With this spirit of division, where we have sect on sect, there can be no union such as that prayed for by our Blessed Lord.

IDEA OF THE CHURCH.

In the work of restoring unity of these various parts, should not the first step be to obtain a clear and distinct idea of what "the Church" is? Is the Church a divine institution, or is she simply an order on this natural plane and an organization similar to the many of our day, made and constituted by men? After all, does not this vast problem (as many others) hinge on that? If the Church is simply an association or a society, contrived by men, then it is not material whether the several branches are organically related or not. And then it matters little whether a person is in membership with one or the other, or no member anywhere. It is a very serious question which needs to be squarely met, whether, in our age that is not, after all, the prevailing sentiment,—whether the idea of the Church as now held differs from any of the so-called human organizations, and whether a person is not as safe in any one of them as in the Church, or as safe without either.

That is not the conception of the apostle as presented in the Epistle to the Ephesians. Here "the Church" is spoken of as a Body—the Body of Christ, and in no sense as an organization originated by men, neither a society formed by "clubbing together."

1. The Church is not a human institution, like any of the worldly orders, the very best of them, neither is she a denomination or a sect, but, 2. A Supernatural Constitution—an order of Grace from heaven, complete and full in the Person of Jesus Christ—a Kingdom, whose object it is to gather into this divine constitution all who obey the call, come from what source it may, for healing, cleansing, for salvation.—So Heid. Cat., Quest. 54. This idea of "the Kingdom," rules the entire New Testament, and in none of the parables can we read anything savoring of such a spirit like to that of our modern denominationalism or sectarianism. All over it we are confronted

with the idea of a body, a divine constitution from heaven, possessing heavenly forces and powers, one life animating every part of it, with no divisive elements. "The Ideal Church" is the power of a new supernatural creation, which has been introduced into the actual history of the world by the incarnation of Jesus Christ, and which is destined to go on, causing "old things to pass away and all things to become new," till it shall triumph fully in the end over all sin and death, and the "whole world shall appear transformed into its image and resplendent with its light." "The fact thus accomplished in His person was at the same time a fact for all time. It included in itself all the resources of life and salvation that were needed for the full redemption of humanity, onward to the grand millennial triumph in which it is destined to have its end. The Church, through all ages, is the depository of these resources." "It (the Church) is a living system, organically bound together in all its parts, springing from a common ground, and pervaded throughout with the force of a common nature. In its very conception, therefore, it is Catholic; that is, one and universal." "The Church, moreover, is the necessary and only form in which Christianity can have a real existence in the world. It is not something added to humanity, as it were from abroad, to assist it in taking upon itself the Christian life as its own highest perfection; but it is this life itself exalting humanity into its own sphere. . . . Out of the Church then, as separated from the general life of Christ, in His people, there can be no true Christian character and no Christian salvation. Christianity and the Church are identical; and it lies in the very idea of this last, that as it is catholic and universal, so it must be also uncompromisingly exclusive." "Through all periods the Church remains the same; and from beginning to end, her history is but the power of a single fact. The actual Church is but a process; not only covering a large field in space, but reaching over a long tract in time." . . . "It is something that grows in the individual and in humanity as a whole. It works like leaven in the mass of the world's life till, in the end, the

whole shall be leavened." . . . "It belongs to the nature of the Church to be one and universal, Catholic as well as holy, in an outward visible way no less than in its unseen constitution. Our whole sect system is something wrong, an abomination in the temple of God, that must pass away before it can be clean and fit for the coming of the Lord." "A Bible society, a temperance union, a benevolent association of any kind, having Christians in its membership, is no church; . . . its organization must be, at the same time, its own, the product of its own life, a true revelation as far as it goes of its own inward constitution."

"The Church of the creed is *life-bearing*. . . . It is a perpetual fact that starts in the incarnation of the Son of God, and reaches forward as a continuous supernatural reality to the end of time. As such a fact, it includes life-powers which were not in the world before; . . . they spring perpetually from Christ Himself; . . . they are present, too, always and only by the presence of the Holy Ghost; . . . it is the power of a divine constitution, which lies at the ground of all individual piety. . . . There are resources and provisions in the Church, real supernatural life-powers, which belong to no other constitution, and which our human society, no matter how organized, must ever fail of reaching under any different form." "Without faith in the Holy Catholic Church, there can be no full abiding faith in the Word made flesh." These quotations are from a sermon, entitled "*The Church*," by Dr. J. W. Nevin, at the opening of the Synod of the Reformed Church, at Carlisle, Pa., October 15, 1846.

Again: "The Church is not a mere aggregation or collection of different individuals, drawn together by similarity of interests and wants; not an abstraction simply, by which the common, in the midst of such multifarious distinction, is separated and put together under a single general term. It is not merely *the all* that covers the actual extent of its membership, but the *whole* rather in which this membership is comprehended and determined from the beginning. The Church does not rest upon its members, but the members rest upon the Church. . . .

We are not Christians each one by himself and for himself, but we become such through the Church. Christ lives in His people, by the life which fills His body, the Church; and they are thus all necessarily one before they can be many."

As to unity. "The Church ought to be visibly one and catholic, as she is one and catholic in her inward life, and the want of such unity, as it appears in the present state of the Protestant world, with its rampant sectarianism and individualism, 'is a lamentation and shall be for a lamentation,' until of God's mercy the sore reproach be rolled away." . . . "Now what is wanted, first of all, is a clear perception, on the part of the Church, that is, on the part of Christians generally, that the want of such visible unity is wrong, and such a wrong as calls aloud continually for redress. . . . The heart of the Church must be filled with an earnest sense of her own calamity, as thus torn and rent with such vast division, before she can be engaged successfully to follow after union and peace. It needs to be deeply pondered upon, that the spirit of sect and party, as such, is contrary to Christ. The present state of the Church involves the sin of schism to a most serious extent. . . . Take it altogether, there is schism in our divisions. The unity of Christ's body is not maintained." From a sermon delivered at the opening of the Triennial Convention of the Reformed Protestant Dutch and German Reformed Church, at Harrisburg, Pa., August 8, 1844, by Rev. J. W. Nevin, D. D.

These quotations, long as they are, give us an insight into the idea of that significant question, "What is the Church?" They show also that that idea involves that of unity—the members of the body inwardly bound together by a common life and working together for a common end. But, in the face of this, have we not something different, the spirit of division and of sect? And, say what we will, with all the union efforts made in the way of evangelizing the masses, as in the Moody meetings, etc., when that effort is over, you have the same antagonistic spirit, as uncharitable as ever before. Who does not feel that this spirit is wrong, "that the whole sect system is some-

thing wrong, an abomination in the temple of God ;" and this feeling of wrong, but still with a fanatical zeal for the Lord in its own denomination or sect, is yearning for something higher and better ; and of late voices itself in expressions of the most noted men in the different denominations, and published in the *Independent* and *Magazine of Christian Literature* ; all deplored these endless divisions and apparently yearning for deliverance and for a unity under some form. But, what is singularly strange, there is not one which touches the question, after all the central one, "What think you of Christ ; what think you of His Body, the Church ?" If our divided Protestantism could make earnest with this question, and be apprehended by the fact that Jesus Christ established a kingdom of which He is King ; that His life and grace are the controlling, ruling forces therein ; that by fellowship with the King in this kingdom the subjects find life, how the denominations and sects would melt away as mist before the rising sun ! Say what we will, here lies the trouble, and it does seem as if faith in the Church in our day, as a supernatural constitution, was lost and the Church dwindled to a simple society or organization constructed by men on the plane simply of the natural. (Luke 18 : 8.)

In the *Magazine of Christian Literature*, for January, 1894, appeared an article from the pen of Dr. Schaff on "Denominationalism and Sectarianism," in which an attempt is made to distinguish between them. It is said, "Denominationalism, as such, may be perfectly compatible with Christian union, as much so as different army corps are with the unity of an army, and different monastic orders with the unity of the Papacy. But sectarianism is essentially exclusive and opposed to co-operation for one common purpose ; it is nothing but extended selfishness under the garb of religious zeal. Denominationalism subordinate to catholic unity and made subservient to it is a blessing. Sectarianism is a curse." "Each denomination should prepare a short, popular and irenic creed of the essential articles which it holds in common with all others, and leave larger confessions of faith to the theologians whose business it is to investigate the

mysteries and to solve the problems of faith." Would not that make the Babel confusion we now have worse confounded? As to the distinction which is made, it is somewhat difficult to see what it is. Are not the largest of our denominations as exclusive, narrow and bigoted as any of what are called sects? In the opinions given in the *Independent* and *Magazine of Christian Literature* on this question of unity, is there not the same opposition to a federal, and much more to an organic, union from that side as from the sects? Have not both sides the same spirit, and is not that the lesson taught all along? And judging from that, union is as far off with the one as it is with the other. What Dr. Schaff wrote in that essay is strikingly said, but may be set down, to a great extent at least, as an after-thought, and presents a distinction without a difference; and that the Episcopal, Methodist and others are sects equally with others. All are born of the same spirit. Only as we see and understand the origin and history of these branches can we judge as to the fitness of propositions made by any one of them towards union.

In the onward course of the Church, the Body of Christ, there is the elimination of that which is foreign to her life, which reveals itself and which calls for reformation. But in all such movements the identity is preserved, and the thread of history, unbroken from age to age is preserved. "Lo, I am with you always." It is in this wise that the spiritual house is going up and will continue until it becomes complete, a holy temple in the Lord. This was true in the days of the Master. He purified the temple, driving out the money-changers. On this ground can the Reformation of the sixteenth century be justified. Whatever were the corruptions and abuses in the Church, one thing must be steadily kept in mind, that over the ages, the Lord maintained and preserved the Church, so that there could be no break and then the starting *de novo* the Body of Christ. The Reformation movement was a purifying process, the men engaged in it simply instruments in the hands of Providence to eliminate abuses, but never to set up a new order. However

much to be regretted the form that movement took, it was, nevertheless in God's hands, as much so as the history of His ancient people when ruled by wicked kings under whose reigns the people forsook the Lord and became idolatrous; the people were not cast off, but, under severe discipline, continued His people. So with the Romish Church. Who will deny that the Romish Church, through that man at Rome, did not save society, over the Middle Ages from ruin? Was not that the best form for society over that interesting and instructive period? It had its day; but it preserved the sacred thread of history unbroken. No, the life of Christ, in His Church, cannot fail. As in former periods, so in this, abuses and corruptions began to show themselves, from which the temple of the Lord had to free itself; these had to be eliminated. This is the significance of the Reformers before the Reformation. "In reality all things were hollow with decay: the mediæval age was over, the preparation for a new age was already accomplished, and the world was waiting for Him who should lead out the people from the house of bondage." "Luther entered upon the inheritance of Wycliffe and of Huss, and still further was he indebted to the spirit of German mysticism. . . . He was not so much a theologian as a man who afforded in his own rich nature, unveiled so completely before his age, the materials for theology. . . . Viewed from the standing point of a formal theology, he is full of inconsistencies and contradictions and even dangerous errors." . . . "The Reformation in Switzerland was independent of the movement led by Luther: it began earlier, it followed a leader widely different in character from the hero of Germany; . . . it was based on a different principle, and reached in theology a different result. While Luther and Zwingli were both indebted to the influence of mysticism, yet that which can be traced only as latent in Luther's mind, or may be implied, but is not clearly stated in the doctrine of justification by faith—the idea of the divine immanence—was the fundamental principle with Zwingli, giving unity and consistency to his life as well as to his theology." (Allen's Continuity of Christian thought, p. 270, etc.)

As to the abuses and corruptions, it was felt by the College of Cardinals that a reformation was absolutely needed (see Bossuet's *Variations*, vol. i.). No, the Church has a life of its own, is not of man, but from heaven, which, however, interfered with and at times seemingly warped and sickly, will never fail, but assert itself, eliminating what is foreign, and continue its course until the consummation. In this view the Reformation can be justified, and furthermore it must be said, that the reformers did not make the Reformation, but were simply instruments in the hands of God to carry forward the work long before commenced. God's purposes and plans could not be thwarted, whatever of self may have entered into that movement, which surely comprised much of self, but that of the English Reformation much more. It was a movement in the interest of morals and religion, and yet how very much of self is mixed up and connected with it! And who knows but God allowed this self, developing into sect on sect, as a discipline to correct, to chastise and to teach His people, and from which now we yearn to be set free? But suppose that is so, what of that? The golden thread of history—the life of Christ—remained unbroken, in some form, no matter how selfish the actors. Heid. Cat., Quest. 54.

It is unfortunate that no agreement was had at the time when this purifying process in the sixteenth century took place. It was a break of a peculiar character, and because of this spirit of independence a door was opened for the almost untold divisions now afflicting this Protestant body. What is more, there is no power to close that door. Dr. Schaff may write, "Variety in Unity," and that Christian civilization is found more vigorous in Protestant than in countries subject to the Pope. But issue is taken with that in a pamphlet by some unknown author in which our boasted Christian civilization is characterized as nothing higher than a *civilized heathenism*. On this seemingly advanced position of Protestant nations not much stress is to be laid; material prosperity is not always a sure sign of real, solid spiritual growth. Protestantism became divisive. The spirit was to fly off, break away, asserting free-

dom over against authority (1 John, ch. 4). How uncompromising this spirit! Witness the Conference at Marburg. What was the result but sect on sect, and among these again divisions and divisions, so that now from this fertile source we have in this country over two hundred sects. For a thorough exposition of the sect system, the reader is referred to two articles in Vol. I. of MERCERSBURG REVIEW by Dr. Nevin. Among other things, it is said, "Not only is our sect system in flat contradiction to the letter of the New Testament: it is at war besides with the divine constitution of Christianity itself. It wrongs the idea of the Church. . . . The bad fruits of the system, in this view, stare us in the face from all sides. . . . It is gross falsehood to say that the influence of sects on one another is wholesome and favorable to the general cause of Christianity. Their emulation is not holy. . . . All zeal for religion is rotten and will be found at last to stink, that springs not from a true interest in religion for its own sake." In this day when propositions are made looking towards union, it would be well to read those articles, containing, as they do, wholesome lessons.

In surveying this vast field and seeing the sects warring and fighting each other, each one claiming superiority, and where special peculiarities are held, on which Shibboleths, as the *sine qua non*, alone a basis is offered whereon union may be predicated; but judging from the jangling voices in the *Magazine of Christian Literature* and the *Independent*, given by representative men, in the Episcopal and other branches, deplored the divisions, longing for union, unfortunately no common basis is proposed whereon to stand to effect it. What in the mean time will take place, God only knows; but that the thread of history —of the Church—shall be broken and lost, amidst this babel confusion can never be, for the "gates of hell shall never prevail." The Church, the life, of Christ is imperishable and will continue whatever sects and foes may do. Now in this seething mass of sect on sect the Episcopal Church is comprehended with all the rest, and from that body come the propositions for union.

It is claimed by some that Christianity was brought to Britain by one of the apostles, and so preserved apostolic succession. That would be entirely to the point were that so. The pretensions of the Episcopal Church cannot be made out historically. The Christianity possessing vigor and force came from Rome. Under the influence of the Papacy the foundations of the vast building, afterward reared, and of which monuments remain to this day, were laid, and the English Church was governed and controlled by the power at Rome, which authority was acknowledged until the time of Henry VIII. The relation between the King and the Pope continued friendly. Indeed, the King was spoken of as the "Defender of the faith." What is to be kept in mind is the fact that the English church originated through influences from Rome, owned allegiance to the Pope, and acknowledged papal authority. Whatever of succession there was came from Rome, and through that source maintained continuity with the ancient faith. (See Dr. Schaff's Ch. Hist., Vol. IV.)

The Schism.—In the movement in which Henry VIII. was one of the principal actors, there was much of the individual and of self. As in the reign of Louis XIV. of France, "I am the State," so in that period, the king would say, "I am the director of the Church." The rupture with Rome led to the schism which is known to every reader of English history. Now commences a reformation. "The Reformation in England was conducted on a method of its own, which differs widely in principle from either of those just mentioned. Its peculiarity lay in the fact that it was essentially a lay movement originating with the King and Parliament rather than with the clergy. Convocation led in no reform, nor had it any disposition to do so; the bishops and clergy accepted and ratified what Parliament dictated. It was the laity and not the clergy who led the Church of England in the great revolution of the sixteenth century, by which the authority of the Bishop of Rome was declared no longer binding." . . . "The theory of the Church which underlay the English Reformation—the tacitly accepted

working theory, whether avowed or not—was not the old Latin idea that the Church lay in the hierarchy. In all the changes that took place, there was implied an organic relationship to the state; the king was regarded as directly and primarily the anointed of God; the Church was simply the whole nation in its religious aspect, for whose well being the king was as directly responsible as for its civil order and prosperity. The worst that is usually said against such a theory is that it is Erastian, whatever that may mean. Cranmer regarded the bishops as holding their jurisdiction from the king, and on the accession of Edward VI., took out a new commission of authority. This theory prevailed through the long reign of Elizabeth before it yielded to another conception of the Church and a different view of the relations of Church and state." (Allen's Continuity, etc., p. 321, etc.) In accordance with this position the succession as now insisted upon was thought unnecessary and was disregarded. "The first English reformers by no means considered ordination by the parent Church, or descending from the parent Church, as necessary. They would have laughed at the man who would have asserted seriously, that the imposition of the hands of the bishop was essential to the validity of ordination. They would not have owned that person as a Protestant, who would have ventured to insinuate that, where this was wanting, there was no Christian ministry, no ordinance, no Church, and perhaps no salvation. The private opinions of the first English reformers were similar to those of the reformers of Switzerland and Geneva. Hooper, in a letter dated February 8, 1550, informs Bullinger that the Archbishop of Canterbury, the Bishops of Rochester, Ely, St. David's, Lincoln and Bath, agreed in *all things* with the Helvetic Churches. . . . Cranmer says positively, that bishops and priests are not two things, but one office, in the beginning of Christ's religion. . . . Latimer and Hooper maintained the identity of bishops and pastors, by divine institution." Burnet tells us that Cranmer went so far as to maintain that "no ordination whatsoever is required to make men bishops or priests, but merely the king's

election and nomination. He contended, in an assembly of bishops, that the king's election and nomination, alone, without any ceremony of ordination, sufficed to make priests and bishops." Dr. Schaff, in *Creeds, etc.*, Vol. I., p. 605, says, "The most learned English divines before the period of the restoration, such as Cranmer, Jewel, Hooker, Field, Ussher, Hall and Stillingfleet, did not hold the theory of an exclusive *jure divino* Episcopacy, and fully recognized the validity of Presbyterian ordination. . . . Bishop Parkhurst uttered a fervent prayer that the Church of England would propose to herself the Church of Zurich as the absolute pattern of a Christian community. Bishop Ponet was of the opinion that the word *Bishop* should be abandoned to the Papists, and that the chief officers of the purified Church should be called *Superintendents*. . . . When in Scotland, Queen Victoria takes the communion from the hands of a Presbyterian parson. Prominent clergymen of the Church of England, such as Travers, Whittingham, Cartwright and John Morrison had received only Presbyterian ordination in foreign churches." Now in the reigns of James and Charles I. a change took place. "The doctrine of the divine and exclusive right of Episcopacy was first intimated, in self-defence, by Bishop Bancroft, of London (in a sermon, 1589), then taught and rigidly enforced by Archbishop Laud, etc.; sanctioned in 1662, by an Act of Uniformity, which forbade any person to hold a benefice or to administer the sacraments before he be ordained a priest by Episcopal ordination. By this cruel act two thousand ministers, including some of the ablest and most worthy men of England, were expelled from office and driven into non-conformity." This smacks somewhat of the uncompromising spirit of sect. From these quotations, and they might be multiplied, it is clear that succession, as now insisted upon and taught by the Episcopal Church was not considered necessary, for in fact it was broken off. But there must be authority somewhere to perpetuate and carry forward the Kingdom of God, to preach the Gospel and to administer the sealing ordinances of the Church. The succession must be pre-

served, but cannot be maintained as insisted upon by the Episcopal Church. The succession, as held by them, was broken, which is admitted by some of the most eminent men in that communion, owning that, historically, it cannot be made out: "We believe in the universal priesthood of Christians, as we believe in the universal kinghood; but for this very reason we have no faith in the idea of a particularistic atomistic exercise of any such high function in either case. The priestly power starts in Christ, and from Him passes over to His Body, the Church, to be exercised from its life as a whole, through organs created for this purpose, and not to be snatched away by profane hands for the use of any and every sect, which may take it into its head to set up a separate priesthood and kinghood in its own name. . . . It is the life of the Church as such, the life of the Church as an organic historical whole, which alone can fully legitimate and clothe with power the needful organs of this life, and their necessary functions. If then we must admit some disturbance in the ordinary law of ministerial succession at the Reformation, it does not follow at once that the succession for this reason fell to the ground: the *true succession lay in the life of the Church as a whole*; and if it can be shown that this gave birth to the Reformation, it must be allowed to have been sufficient at the same time to make good, in the way of inward reproductive force, any *unavoidable* defect that was found to attend, in this revolution, the outward genealogy of the Protestant ministry. After all, *it is the Church, the presence of Christ's life in His Body, which supports the true line of the ministry*, and not the line of the ministry that upholds mechanically the being and authority of the Church. The Reformation was the product of the old Catholic Church itself: the central consciousness of the Christian world had been struggling towards it for centuries before; it was in the end the organic outburst plainly of the life of Christianity, as an objective historical whole, which simply laid hold of the reformers, and brought itself to pass by them as its organs, without any calculation of their own."

(Dr. Nevin, M.R. REV., Vol. I., p. 385.)

Now what took place under Henry VIII. is repeated under the reigns of Edward VI. and Queen Elizabeth. But space will not allow the reproduction of this interesting period; and the reader is referred to "The Puritan in Holland, England and America," by Douglas Campbell, Vol. I., pp. 432, etc. In the revision of the Book of Common Prayer, assistance came from the Continent and from the old Catholic Church, perpetuating herself in that large, broad stream of Reformed type. "In England, during the reign of Edward VI., the tendency of the Reformation, under an influence from Geneva, had been towards Calvinism. The preachers who fled to the Continent, under his successor, had, therefore, a predisposition in that direction. The reception accorded them in their various asylums made it more decided. In Germany, among the Lutherans, they were neglected and frequently insulted, while by the Calvinists of Switzerland they were received with open arms." This part is really a sad history. The history of the Church during the reigns of Henry VIII., under Edward and that of Queen Elizabeth is dreary and dismal. Talk of the persecutions of Rome, and they appear insignificant when compared with those carried on during the reign of that wretched queen. The condition of the Church and of the clergy was most wretched—the corruptions existing among clergy and people shocking. All this is strikingly told in the history by Douglas Campbell in his intensely interesting work. "The queen was the great despoiler of the Church, . . . and she thus robbed even the universities themselves." It is truly wonderful how dark that period is, full of persecution and of corruption. To satisfy any one let him consult Campbell, Vol. I.

From what has been said, any one can easily see that the Episcopal Church does not occupy that commanding position which she claims and which would entitle her to become the nucleus around which Protestantism is to gather. She owes much of what she is to the Reformed. In the completion of her Book of Common Prayer she was assisted by theologians from the Continent, especially Switzerland, and what assistance came

from Germany was of a decidedly Reformed tendency. This is evident from her Thirty-nine Articles, which are in spirit Reformed. She acknowledged this influence through her representative men. From a letter preserved in Zurich: "The Swiss churches were in 1547 informed that the Church of England had adopted the Reformed doctrine of the Lord's Supper." "It should also be remembered that, as late as 1618, an English delegation was sent, by the authority of King James I., to the Reformed Synod of Dordrecht in Holland, and that the Protestant Episcopal Church of England was there recognized as one of the Reformed churches." The delegation to that Synod consisted of George Charleton, Bishop of Llandaff; Joseph Hall, Dean of Worcester; Samuel Ward, Archdeacon of Taunton, and John Davenant, Professor of Theology at Cambridge. Bishop Jewel, the final reviser of the Thirty-nine Articles, wrote to Peter Martyr (February 7, 1562): "As to matters of doctrine, we have pared everything away to the very quick, and do not differ from you by a nail's breadth; for as to the ubiquitarian (that is, the Lutheran) theory, there is no danger in this country. Opinions of that kind can only gain admittance where the stones have sense." Has the Episcopal Church forgotten this; or, knowing it, is unwilling to acknowledge it? What must be insisted on in all this history is that the theory of Apostolic Succession, as now held and insisted upon, ignoring ordination and confirmation, administered outside of her pale as invalid, because administered by, what that branch affirmed, non-ordained ministers, is given up as untenable and at variance with facts and with history; and therefore the Episcopal Church presents so little of her own in the way of claim to be regarded as a standard to which all Protestantism is to flock and become the nucleus for union. In a word, there is no more here for such a claim than from any other sect.

ATTEMPTS MADE TOWARDS UNION.

To move in the direction of union, the Episcopal Church submitted several propositions as a basis. The four propositions are as follows:

I. The Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments, as containing all things necessary to salvation, and as being the rule and ultimate standard of faith.

II. The Apostles' Creed, as the Baptismal Symbol; and the Nicene Creed, as the sufficient statement of the Christian faith.

III. The two Sacraments, ordained by Christ Himself—Baptism and the Supper of the Lord,—ministered with unfailing use of Christ's words of institution, and the elements ordained by Him.

IV. The Historic Episcopate, locally adapted in the methods of its administration to the varying needs of the nations and peoples called of God into the unity of His Church.

These were the proposed propositions. Often the spirit of union seizes the masses, which are gloriously drawn together only to fly asunder and drift back into old ruts as soon as that which draws wanes and passes away. You see this in the large meetings held in the various cities occasionally, and it is a question whether in any one that of unity was advanced beyond what it had been before the work was undertaken. In the *Magazine of Christian Literature* opinions from different bishops are given, and all hinged on the Episcopate. The same is true with regard to the Tract by Dr. Shields, of Princeton, on the Historic Episcopate as a basis of unity. The answers from the bishops all agree on one thing, the Episcopate; on the other side, a denial of the claim and a positive refusal. In these answers you have cropping out the confirmed prejudice of certain forms and rites as the *sine qua non* of unity; especially that of Dr. Tyler and others. But the succession was broken—was given up as unnecessary, and was it not an after-thought on the part of Bancroft and Laud to bolster up a peculiar theory which they advocated? (See Schaff's Creeds, etc., *Anglican Art. of Religion*, etc.)

Another significant fact, having a strong bearing on this subject, occurred a few years ago, when an attempt was made by the Episcopal Church to unite, if possible, with the Greek

Church. The history of that effort is interesting and instructive. We quote from the *Magazine of Christian Literature*, December No., 1892, p. 219. . . . Mr. Blunt says distinctly that "no minister of any Protestant community, British or foreign, has ever been received as, or permitted to act as, a priest of the Church of England, whatever form of ordination he may have gone through, until he had been ordained at the hands of a bishop." Then follows: "This last statement is one of which one can only say that, if a man could write it, believing it to be true, he must be so ignorant of his subject that he ought not to attempt to write at all; and if otherwise, it would be equally unnecessary and uncourteous to characterize him as he deserves." Again: . . . "that the views of modern high churchmen were not held at all in the early Reformed Church of England, and that the principles of the Reformation 'are more honored in the breach than in the observance.'" We refer more particularly to a work entitled "Notes of a Visit to the Russian Church in the year 1840-'1," by the late Rev. William Palmer. Mr. Palmer went to pay a visit to the Eastern Church in Russia to study its characteristics on the spot. . . He took with him a copy of the Thirty-nine Articles in Latin, together with an introductory Dissertation upon them of his own in the same language. . . . Thus furnished, Mr. Palmer went to St. Petersburg, and in accordance with his theory as a High Churchman, in the modern sense, representing himself to the authorities of the Russian Church, requested to be admitted to communion; not, that is, to be reconciled or admitted as a convert from without, but as, so to speak, belonging of right to the Russian Church by virtue of his membership of the Anglican, on the ground that those two churches were equally branches of the one Catholic and Apostolic Church. One of his principal interlocutors is M. Mouravieff, the Unter-Prokurer of the Holy Synod (the governing body since Peter the Great's time) of the Russian Church, who, though a layman, was an ecclesiastical official and a well-known author on Russian ecclesiastical history. In one of their numerous conferences the following occurs: On my urging on

him a special prayer for the Anglican Church, he said: "We know you only as heretics. You separated from the Latin Church three hundred years ago, as the Latins had before that fallen away from the Greek. We think even the Latin Church heretical, but you are an apostasy from an apostasy, a progression from bad to worse." Again, M. Mouravieff says: "You were a portion of the Pope's Patriarchate, and you rebelled against him." Upon Mr. Palmer objecting, he said: "Did he not send Augustine to convert you? Anyhow, the Pope had acquired, and the Church had confirmed to him, very great power. And did not one of your kings even make England a fief of the Pope?" "If we had any communication with your Church, it must be through the Pope and the Church of Rome. Nor can we recognize you otherwise. Reconcile yourself to your own Patriarch first, and then come and talk to us, if you think you have anything to say to us." And so on, more to the same effect from a priest named Rjachoffsky, and the Metropolitan of Moscow, the highest dignitary of the Russian Church.

That interview places the Episcopal or Anglican Church in a peculiar light and falls in with what we attempted to place before the reader, and puts the Church on a par with other bodies, being nothing less than a schism. That being the case, the Episcopal Church is ill prepared to offer herself as a nucleus around which denominations and sects are to gather by offering a basis on which to unite. No, the Apostolic Succession as held and insisted on is an absurdity, and yet that body is to be commended for moving towards union, and is a challenge to the various Protestant bodies at least to consider the propositions made. If union is to be effected, some basis whereon that may be must be found, and where can a basis be found like that offered by the Reformed? Here is a succession resting, not outwardly with bishops, but, as already shown, resting in the Church, and in whose bosom it is carried forward and from thence dispensed. Ordination, if any thing, is more certain in this form than the succession insisted upon by the high church-

men. Here, too, is a platform which is broad and Catholic—that of the Apostle's Creed. She is simply the legitimate succession of the old Church, purged and purified from corruptions and abuses, is simply the Catholic Church (not Romish) having eliminated impurities, and unites in herself all the essential elements of Christianity as set forth in the Apostles' Creed. Her platform is broad, and what is essential to a true Christian faith is found here, which essentials are accepted by the largest portion of the Protestant world. The spirit of the Anglican Church is that of the Reformed. Her theology is that of the Reformed. Her doctrine, as set forth in the Thirty-nine Articles, is Reformed. Her doctrine on the Lord's Supper is that of the Reformed, and even her theory, insisting on a succession, is not different, though coming through a different channel. Though regarded by the Greek Church as a schism, she had, nevertheless, the tact to accept the life of that grand stream, so wide and broad, coming down in the long line and through the Reformation fires, and now known as the Reformed.

But it may be said that, what is now known as the Reformed Church, is but a small body in comparison with other and larger bodies. But that signifies little or nothing at all. Mohammedanism and Buddhism are numerically vastly more than all of Protestantism combined, and yet you say that does not count. Take any one or all of the denominations and sects in the land and examine the history and you will find that which is essential, on which the Reformed has always insisted, is the same broad, Catholic, Reformed platform, and on the other hand, that which gives the peculiarity of sects and denominations, as in the case of the Episcopal, the Episcopate; the Presbyterian, that of rigid Calvinism; of the Baptist, the theory of Baptism, etc., the Reformed never regarded these shibboleths as essential to salvation, and neither do any enter into her platform. If any of the denominations and sects have these shibboleths, and on which, as they suppose, their life depends, the Reformed has none. It may be objected that the Reformed is a sect with the rest, and if what has been published in a cer-

tain book, purporting to give a history of her origin, by Rev. Jas. I. Good, were true and correct, such would be her position. It is said, "that she is an offshoot from the Lutheran." Rev. Jas. I. Good must have read that history to little account to pen such a sentence. His vision must have been very narrow indeed. No; history does not teach such a beginning. She is not a development from Lutheranism. She reaches far back into the past, the life of Christ, unfolding itself over the ages, in that which was the Holy Catholic Church, and in these Reformation days asserted herself anew; not as a new, but the old order, bearing heavenly powers and forces. She is neither Lutheran, nor Episcopal, nor Romish, but is Catholic.

Whatever may be thought of this, one thing is certain that here is a basis, the old Apostles' Creed, on which our divided Protestantism might unite, and if ever union is to be effected it must be on some such basis broad and Catholic as that offered in that large, wide stream comprehended in what is known as the Reformed type.

IV.

EVOLUTION AND ETHICS.

BY REV. R. LEIGHTON GERHART, A.M.

EVOLUTION thinks of the world and every living thing in it as advancing, through the operation of certain laws and by gradual progressive changes, from a rudimentary or incipient state to a completed or finished form. This doctrine, by no means new in the history of human thought, was in modern times first suggested by Des Cartes, and afterwards wrought out definitely by Leibnitz. The latter not only advanced the theory of creation by gradual processes, but conceived also, very clearly and definitely, what is now the very back-bone of the system, namely, the conservation of force—the doctrine that force, by an inherent law of persistency, is never lost, but simply changes its form, finding in the new form, which it assumes, a full equivalent.

On the basis of the general hypothesis there is room for widely divergent views.

Evolution may be regarded as the unfolding, from the rudimentary state, of beings whose type of life and whose genetic and specific features never transcend the predetermined form and mode of action and life incipiently involved in the beginning. Though each distinct species, much more each distinct order, is true to its own ideal norm, yet each attains completeness by gradual growth and development through many successive generations. This is accomplished by the action of the inherent law of life of each species or order, working from within, in conjunction with the forces of the natural world which affect it from without.

Again, evolution may conceive of all living beings as coming from certain primordial germs, which advance to ultimate completeness through a series of changes wrought almost wholly by

external causes, which so affect the primordial germs as to lead, in the course of time, to the production of every kind and species of plant, insect and animal, including man, which now exists. Instead of the distinctive nature and type of life, ultimately evolved, being the unfolding of an ideal involved by creation in the germ, the cause which works distinctions and differences in orders and species of life is made to reside in those forces, acting upon the germ from without. The primordial germ is thus susceptible of becoming a reptile, bird, beast or man as it is outwardly affected. This view, called Transformism, the evolution of one species of plant or animal from a lower and wholly different species, was first advanced by Lamarck, and has since been more completely developed by Darwin. The latter carries his theory so far as to regard all species as having been derived originally from one, or a very few, very low forms of life.

Or, evolution may descend still further, and assume the position occupied by Mr. Spencer. This view begins by affirming the existence of a homogeneous mass, "a *protoplasma* apt to take any kind of form. This protoplasma, in virtue of two laws (the instability of the homogeneous and the multiplicity of effects), incessantly passes from the homogeneous to the heterogeneous, whence comes the formation of species, varieties, races. All animal life ramifies by progressive differentiations, just as the individual, starting from the indistinct state of the germ, determines more and more at each new degree of its development."* The evolution thus described does not proceed from a self-conscious and free personality to definite ends, but from a power unconscious, unintelligent and indeterminate. The mind of man, the instinct of the beast, the plastic force revealed in the plant, and the laws governing the formation of rock and earth, are alike the product of this multiplicity of effects acting without foreknowledge or intent upon this homogeneous protoplasmic mass, which, in turn, responds without foreknowledge or intent.

* Janet, *Final Causes*, p. 273.

Evolution, as thus set before us, designated the cosmical process, carries in it three distinct conceptions.

It involves the conception of necessity. Under certain conditions the plant, the insect, the animal is formed and developed without consciousness of what it is to become, and without power to frustrate the forces working to develop it.

It involves the conception of actual transmission to succeeding generations of the natural and physical powers of the preceding generation. There may be increased power, beauty and sagacity; but it is wholly involved in the physical. As the progress of the plant or animal is wholly involved in the physical, so degeneracy follows in the same order.

It involves the conception of the modification and change, by gradual and almost imperceptible approaches, of different forms of life from an almost imperceptible point or germ to the fully grown, fully developed, fully endowed plant and animal.

Though there are strange foreshadowings in the plant, insect and animal worlds of what are the characteristics of man, the moment investigation begins that moment broad, deep lines of divergence appear. This divergence is so palpable that even the most pronounced evolutionist of the Transformist faith is compelled to confess, that the ethical process is distinct from the cosmical. "Social progress," Mr. Huxley tells us, "means a checking of the cosmical process at every step and the substitution for it of another, which may be called the ethical process; the end of which is not the survival of those who may happen to be the fittest, in respect of the whole conditions which exist, but of those who are ethically the best." With increased emphasis, he affirms: "Let us understand once for all that the ethical process of society depends, not on imitating the cosmical, still less in running away from it, but in combatting it."

We have here drawn in clear, precise words a broad distinction—a distinction so great that it amounts to a recognition of different orders of being, which, however closely united, have different spheres of operation, and are animated by different principles. In what does this distinction consist?

The source and spring of the ethical life is the mysterious, partially known force, the will, which is characterized by its freedom from physical necessity, and its freedom from compelled acquiescence in those principles which may be recognized as highest and best for the ethical life. While the will feels the need of observing and doing that which is true for it, yet it feels the obligation accompanied by the knowledge that it may set this obligation at defiance, and determine itself to accomplish those very things which it knows to be untrue and self-destructive. As unbound by physical necessity, as beyond sensible cognition, as holding and governing in a sphere of truth apprehensible by the mind alone, the will is not material, but spiritual; not natural, but supernatural.

The will is governed in its activity by the apprehension of truth, which is for it the *sine qua non* of freedom. This truth, which it appropriates, does not consist, however, in the knowledge of the laws governing the physical universe in any of its processes, but in the knowledge of the principles governing the ethical life, which are not susceptible of being transmuted or cast into material forms, or in any manner subdued to the sphere of action, or the mode of being, holding in the cosmical. On the basis of truth thus received the mind reveals one of its highest gifts, that of forecasting an end; an end which it holds before it as unattained, but as susceptible of attainment. Man as an ethical being has the power of projecting before himself a conception of that which he ought to be, but which he is not. He not only has the power of doing this, but there is no true ethical progress until this is done. The decalogue consequently sets before man, as obligatory for him, a law of life which no human being had ever fully and completely obeyed. This law not only served to maintain the man in the possession of those ethical states of being to which he had attained, but did more; it opened before him a higher world of spiritual excellencies, which he was under bond to strive to attain. Through his intelligence it appealed to the conscience within him, and thus became an end, which the will felt moved to make practically real for itself.

By the apprehension of the truth man advances. Each individual appropriates, by his own power of acquisition and diligence, that which is made known to him. He grows ethically, as well as intellectually, by learning. Whatever be the development of brain capacity and nerve organization by congenital transmission from one generation to another, the deepest researches of the physiological psychologist fail to detect any physical ground for belief of congenital transmission of intellectual and moral conceptions. There may be a gradual development of brain organization,—the material vehicle of spirit,—there may be a gradual refinement of nervous organization,—the material vehicle of the spirit's communion and converse with the outer world,—but of inherited moral, æsthetic and scientific truth there is no sign. The moral and intellectual acquisitions of the past are transmitted from one generation to another by instruction, oral, written or printed. The printed page thus stands as one of the signs of the unique character of mind.

That which is thus transmitted from preceding to succeeding generations, through thought and experience, becomes better and more clearly known; and by those who stand on the summit of the world's progress is transmitted to those who stand on the slopes. Thus truth, uttered and re-uttered, filtrates downward till it reaches the plain where the multitudes stand, and becomes the world's possession. The process, however, by which knowledge is acquired is one of the most mysterious of psychological problems. So far as any element or principle of knowledge is new, it comes with the force and in the form of an intuition—a flash of light from the inscrutable depths of spirit. On the other hand, progress in the sphere of the cosmical is by transmission, under pressure of necessity, of physical properties and qualities. The plant and animal must become that which the law of their own being, under the proper physical conditions, tends to make them. There is no self-consciousness; there is no forecasting an end; there is no transmission from generation to generation of anything analogous to an intellectual perception. So far as there is progress, a refinement of type, it is wholly a physical process.

All truth, all sense of obligation, every activity of the will, together with emotion and sensation, all appear united with a distinct recognition of self-hood in consciousness, which, according to Professor Baldwin, "is a dynamic creative thing with regard to its own content." Here appears in the world that power of manhood which, perhaps of all others, shows most broadly the gap between man and all orders of life beneath him. The man carries within him an inward illumination, a light that burns incessantly, bringing out the distinctive features of all his feelings, aspirations, thoughts and deeds so that he enters into possession of them as his own, in a manner beyond the almost boundless limits of similitude and analogy to set forth. But more, in consciousness we find the break in the now generally recognized reign of the conservation of force, which appears to hold with undisputed sway in the universe without the man. Whatever be the vital force with which energy persists, simply changing its form as matter is decomposed, but never failing to find its equivalent, with the birth of consciousness this law ceases to operate. Sensation may find its equivalent in thought; but "mental elements come and go in experience without our being able to point to an equivalent." "The doctrine of the conservation of energy makes the material world into a totality, which we indeed can never measure, but in which the fate of the individual forms and elements can be traced. The mental world has no corresponding law to exhibit."^{*}

With the dawn of consciousness and the apprehension of truth, man begins to create his environments. He creates environments to meet not only his immediate need, but environments to meet what he conceives to be his future need. All nature is directed gradually from that course, which under the ordinary working of natural law it follows, into a course prescribed by his intelligence. While he creates no essentially new force, yet by physical combinations he brings to light forces which in the laboratory of nature have never been discovered. Through the free activity of his intelligence,

* "Outlines of Psychology," by Harold Höffding.

in the magic light of his imagination, he calls into being instruments and machines which operate, seemingly in direct violation of the order of nature, for a foreseen end, which for the man is good. The most far-reaching environments which he creates, though manifest through material instrumentalities, are superphysical, intangible, viewless; they are wholly intellectual, aesthetic, moral and religious, and stand before us outwardly expressed, in the college, the seminary, the scientific and art schools;—worlds these are of principles, ideas and facts where personality is the power, and personality armed with knowledge the result. From these worlds man goes forth to loose the mystic bands binding the elements in their native courses, that he may subject them to the deeper servitude of his will, and make them instruments for the expression and advancement of his highest interests. The forces of nature thus become no longer hindrances to his progress, but the very means of his highest advancement; nature in its manifold features and multiplied forces becomes the manifestation of personality, the outward and material garb of spirit; the world becomes more and more man's larger self.

Mr. Huxley tells us that the ethical is advanced by combatting the cosmical process. Combatting the cosmical process is simply the primary stage of the conversion of the physical into an instrument and means for the expression of the ethical. Combatting the cosmical for the advancement of the ethical is not strictly true even in part. The cosmical is not a hindrance to the progress of the ethical, much less is it a bar to that progress; it is the means and instrument by which the distinctively human comes to clear self-consciousness, by which the reason is stimulated and developed, by which the moral nature is awakened, by which the will acquires supreme force for the man. It becomes even more; it becomes a means for the revelation and communion of God with man. As a being between two worlds, to both of which he is intimately allied, the material universe on the one side and the heavenly on the other, man stands. And it is through activity in relation to both that he becomes more

and more the man. The physical reaches its highest end through a process of ethical sublimation, as seen in the part the material and natural plays in religion and morals, in science and art, and in all the outward forms in which the barbaric and most highly civilized life expresses itself. Natural laws are nature's vehicles for the operation of spirit; and spirit is distinguished by its power of self-determination in accordance with the truth. We are not living in the age of the reign of physical law, nor in the reign of moral law,—considered as moral necessity,—but in the age of the self-determination of spirit in the fulfillment of law. The spirit makes natural law co-operate with natural law, and produces results which nature, apart from man, knows nothing. These results, whatever form they take, find their meaning and end ultimately in the ethical and religious.

While physical conditions affect and modify the body of man, and through that affect and modify in a measure his mind, yet the progress and retrogression of man are so independent of these conditions that he grows and thrives, degenerates and dies, while outwardly the world remains unchanged. On the other hand, given a permanent environment, with no outward enemy to destroy them, and the plant and animal continue their existence, neither retrograding nor advancing, at least so far as history holds any record. The lion, the tiger, the horse and numerous other animals known to us, have reached their final form, and are what they have been through indefinite centuries. In the human world how different! Persia, Assyria, Egypt, Palestine are, so far as soil, climate and natural resources go, the same that they were when thronged with populous cities and ruled over by high intelligence, courage and faith. Heights of splendid achievement in art, in science, in philosophy, in religion, have been attained; then, though no adequate cause can be found in the physical life of the people, while the lands they inhabit remain as well adapted to human life as ever before, gradually there comes a change: over the vision there comes a cloud; the hand loses its cunning; the tongue its power of speech; faith changes to superstition; dominion over nature

ceases. Instead of being lord over himself and lord over the world beneath him, man sinks more and more to a level with the brute, coming more and more under the dominion of the physical. So repeated and so general has been this degeneracy that the scientist is compelled to confess, that there is not on the face of the earth to-day a nation or tribe which, with any degree of certainty, can be regarded as setting forth before us a true example of primitive man.* When we inquire the causes, we are quickly brought to see that they are pre-eminently moral and intellectual. Man has ceased to obey the truth; he has ceased to obey the law of his spiritual life; he has yielded his will to the dominion of his sensuous nature; his retrogression is the consequence of transgression.

"Bear witness, Greece, thy living page !
 Attest it many a deathless age !
 While kings, in dusty darkness hid,
 Have left a nameless pyramid,
 Thy heroes, though the general doom
 Hath swept the column from the tomb,
 A mightier monument command,
 The mountains of their native land !
 There points thy Muse to stranger's eye
 The graves of those that cannot die !
 'Twere long to tell, and sad to trace,
 Each step from splendor to disgrace ;
 Enough—no foreign foe could quell
 Thy soul, till from itself it fell ;
 Yes ! self-abasement forced the way
 To villain-bonds and despot sway."

And these words spoken of Greece are, so far as we have any knowledge, true of all other nations. The prophet's word of warning to Israel is written deep in the moral and spiritual life

* Mr. Herbert Spencer warns us "that we are not permitted to assume that in modern savage races we see beings very like the primitive men, because 'there are reasons for suspecting that men of the lowest types now known . . . do not exemplify men as they originally were. Probably most of them had ancestors in higher states,'"—"Principles of Sociology," Vol. I., p. 93; quoted by Dr. Kellogg in "The Genesis and Growth of Religion," pp. 49, 50.

of mankind ; and our Saviour reiterated that same warning when he said : "Man cannot live by bread alone." Let him seek to live by bread alone, and that moment, intellectually and spiritually, he begins to perish. For the support of his true life he needs to be nourished by every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of God. Only when he lives by that word does power come to him to rise above the law of physical necessity ; to subdue the world to truly human ends ; to transform his environments into an instrument of ministration to his highest needs, and not be degraded to the level of the environments with which the physical process surrounds him. Let him seek to live by bread alone, and to that extent the laws of animal life become more and more dominant in him ; he becomes more dependent upon causes acting upon him from without ; he is directed more and more by instinct and brutish impulse ; he becomes simply a portion of the cosmical process, and this process is powerless to lift him above itself.

There is in man, of his very constitution, an element differing in nature and form of manifestation from that revealed in any other creature—the spiritual. While not free from the law of the physical, he yet shows a power of self-direction, of choice, which places his life upon a wholly different plane from that held by the animal. He moves in the sphere of freedom ; the brute, in that of necessity. He is, in a large measure, his own cause ; the brute is throughout the effect of causes. His world is the inaudible, intangible, viewless world of truth, beauty, harmony ; that of the brute, the sensuous and material. He lives by that and for that which has no reality for lower forms of life ; and living by that and for that which has no reality for lower forms of life, he rises just in the degree that he brings into subordination to himself the very forces in utter submission to which the animal lives, and in defiance of which it always perishes. It is in the spiritual constitution of man that the explanation is to be sought of the deepest phenomena of his varied and wonderful life.

In considering the distinction between the physical and the

ethical, the contrast must be drawn between the highest and most complete form which the ethical assumes, and the most fully expressed form of the physical. The point of contrast is not between the lowest type of human life and the highest type of animal life, but between the highest expression of the human and the highest expression of the animal; not between the Kafir and the baboon, but between the representative or typical man and the representative or typical animal. The lines of divergence may in the beginning run so close as to confuse the judgment, yet the angle of divergence, so plainly apparent as the lines are extended, is no greater in the end than in the beginning. The resemblance between the man and the animal seems to increase the farther we descend into barbaric life; yet the essential distinction is no less between the Kafir and the baboon than between the highest exponent of the most civilized nation and the most completely developed animal. It is always man and the animal, though it is not until we ascend to the height of the grand representative men of the world's most advanced civilization, and finally stand reverently before the divine-human Christ, the Saviour and Lord of the world, that the mighty gap between man and all other created beings is fully seen.

In view of this radical distinction between the physical and the ethical, in what sense, we inquire, can the term evolution be applied to ethics? Mr. Huxley has no doubt that the moral sentiments originated in the same way as other natural phenomena by a process of evolution, but confesses frankly, that no "discovery of how the good and evil tendencies came about is competent to furnish us any better reason why what we call good is preferable to what we call evil than we had before."* There is then a power or faculty possessed by man, enabling him to distinguish good from evil, whose origin this able scientist does not believe investigation can ever discover. But once the moral elements in man's nature have been thus evolved, Mr. Huxley tells us, "the ethical progress of society," and of necessity that of the individual too, "depended not in imita-

* "Evolution and Ethics," by Thomas H. Huxley, p. 33.

ting the cosmical process, still less in running away from it, but in combatting it." With the birth of the ethical, cosmical evolution, as a process of human advancement, ceased. From that time man entered upon a new phase of existence, and his progress was made under conditions the very reverse of those to which he owed his moral life. That is without question a paradox not readily explained.* However faint may have been the conception of primitive man of right and wrong, it is evident that in some degree this antagonism began with that incipient perception. Whether by slow degrees, or rapidly, the time came when the first man knew good from evil, and felt the obligation to do the one and avoid the other. His knowledge

* There is wide divergence of opinion amongst evolutionists with reference to the origin of man. Alfred Russell Wallace, one of the foremost, who shares with Mr. Darwin the origination of the theory of the origin of species by natural selection, says:

"I fully accept Mr. Darwin's conclusions as to the essential identity of man's bodily structure with that of the higher mammalia, and his descent from some form common to man and the anthropoid. The evidence of such descent appears to me to be overwhelming and conclusive. . . . But this is only the beginning of Mr. Darwin's work. . . . His whole argument tends to the conclusion that man's entire nature and all his faculties, whether moral, intellectual, or spiritual, have been derived from their rudiments in the lower animals, in the same manner, and by the action of the same general laws, as his physical nature has been derived. This conclusion appears to me not to be supported by adequate evidence, and to be directly opposed to many well-ascertained facts. . . . To prove continuity and the progressive development of the intellectual and moral faculties from animals to man, is not the same as proving that these faculties have been developed by natural selection. . . . Because man's physical structure has been developed from an animal form by natural selection, it does not necessarily follow that his mental nature, even though developed *pari passu* with it, has been developed by the same causes only." "Darwinism," pp. 461, 463. "These special faculties . . . clearly point to the existence in man of something which he has not derived from his animal progenitors—something which we may best refer to as being of a spiritual essence or nature. . . . These faculties could not possibly have been developed by means of the same laws which have determined the progressive development of the organic world in general, and also of man's physical organism." *Ib.*, pp. 474, 475. He further maintains that these faculties "point clearly to an unseen universe—to a world of spirit to which the world of matter is altogether subordinate." *Ib.*, p. 476.

of right and wrong, his conception of the meaning and applicability of the moral law, his sense of obligation, his power of execution, then advanced according to the norm of the ethical, and not according to the norm of the cosmical. In forming an opinion of the applicability of the term evolution, or of any of the laws or principles or words characteristic of evolution, this distinction must be observed.

However physical nature may serve to illustrate the spiritual, however closely the two may be involved, they nevertheless represent two orders of creation, whose forms of manifestation, whose essential qualities, whose purposes are radically distinct. This distinction runs through the height and depth of each, however co-working, nowhere crossing. To apply the laws and principles manifested in the one to the other, is to lose sight of this distinction. And when the laws governing the lower, and the names characterizing the method of creation, revealed in the lower are applied to the higher, there must follow a leveling of the higher to the plane of the lower.

That physical nature is a parable of the spiritual, and in the Scriptures is everywhere so used, we have no desire to question. That all words may in their origin, as Höffding, Porter and others admit, have had a sensuous meaning, may also be true; but in the degree that words describing the forms and modes of operation of the physical are used to illustrate and expound the spiritual they undergo a sublimation, and come to have a new and distinct signification, characteristic of that higher sphere to which they are transferred. So we are told to "*grow in grace*;" but this growth is unlike the increase in size, change of shape, and unfolding of new features shown by the plant and animal; and so far as spiritual growth is reflected in physical nature it is a material symbolism of a distinctly spiritual fact, to which the physical and the forms and processes of the physical bear no essential resemblance. So we cannot take the word "*evolution*," the shibboleth of the materialistic school of philosophy, and apply it to the spiritual life without

giving the word a newer and higher meaning. The failure to do this results in the leveling of the spiritual to the plain of the earthly.

One of the most notable efforts of this kind is given us in Dr. Drummond's famous "Natural Law in the Spiritual World." "The position we have been led to take up," this writer informs us, "is not that the Spiritual Laws are analogous to the Natural Laws, but that *they are the same laws.*" The italics are his own. "It is not a question of analogy, but of identity." Again: "The Natural Laws, as the Law of Continuity might well warn us, do not stop with the visible, and then give place to a new set of laws bearing a strong similitude to them. The laws of the invisible are the same laws, projections of the natural, not supernatural." Again: "And if the analogies of Natural Law can be extended to the spiritual world, that whole region at once falls within the domain of science and secures a basis as well as an illumination in the constitution and course of Nature."

Resting on these general principles, undoubtedly containing elements of truth, Dr. Drummond begins, and using definitions and in some places the phraseology of the materialistic school of evolution for his guide and support, proceeds. The result is an unmistakable weaving into spiritual conceptions, not the general ideas of order, sequence and relation merely, but conceptions of materialistic relations and processes. The tendency of this is not to give us a more correct view of the future world, but to make that world, on a higher plane, simply a kind of second earth.

Another effort in this field, though in an entirely different direction, is Dr. Lyman Abbott's "Evolution of Christianity." Basing himself on Professor Le Conte's definition of evolution as a "continuous progressive change, according to certain laws, and by means of resident forces," and Prof. Max Muller's definition of religion as consisting in "the perception of the Infinite under such manifestations as are able to influence the moral character of man," he goes forward. Great emphasis is

necessarily laid on the immanence of God in the unfolding of His purpose,—so great that the transcendence of God is largely thrown into the back ground. The Saviour is represented as being the product of the resident forces in humanity, and as a consequence His unique character as the Son of God is lost sight of, and He is degraded to the position of something a little better than the world's greatest teacher. As Dr. Abbott clings very closely to the materialistic view of the origin of man, it necessarily follows that he abandons the belief in the fall of man, and inclines strongly to that view of sin which makes it coincident with incomplete development. There is, therefore, no place in this work for the atonement; and spiritual regeneration is largely, if not wholly, of an ethical character; and progress the result of a further evolution along the lines of truth upon which it has been placed by Jesus, the Lord. One feels, on concluding the volume, as if little was left of that which is distinctively Christian. It is impossible to conceive how any other result could have been reached on the basis of the definitions from which Dr. Abbott makes his start.

It is, however, not only of importance for us, in considering the principles and facts of evolution, to draw clearly the line of distinction between the physical and spiritual orders of existence, but also to consider the relative worth of the principles and facts of these two orders.

In determining the value of all evidences of the nature of human progress, ethical truths must be rated not only at as high a degree of worth as truths derived from the study of the physical and material world, but much higher, inasmuch as they are the most real and the most important. There are two orders of laws; there are two orders of facts; there are two orders of truth;—those of the physical and material nature, and those of the ethical nature. The laws, the truths, the facts of the physical are reached through the direct testimony of the senses; the laws, the truths, the facts of the ethical, through the testimony of the spirit of man in communion with the spir-

itual world. Man stands between two worlds, the earthly and the heavenly; his mind opens upwards and downwards. To him the material world that can be seen, heard, handled, tasted, smelled, is a veritable fact; but to him also the world of morals that cannot be seen, heard, handled, tasted or smelled is also a veritable fact. He knows with certainty that he is under the law of the physical and material; but he knows also that he is under the law of the ethical and spiritual. He can neither deny the one nor the other. He can, however, bring himself into subjugation to the one, to the overthrow of the rightful authority of the other. He can deny the ethical and accept the rule of the physical; if so, he becomes bestial. He can subordinate the physical to the authority of the ethical; if so, he grows in the power and majesty of manhood. The testimony of his own individual experience, the testimony of his own times, the testimony of history, witness to the reality of the ethical in the outward and inward prosperity which its rightful recognition brings. History is the testimony of the ages to the reality of the intangible, invisible, inaudible facts, principles and truths of the moral and spiritual world. If these were not real, man would neither rise by obedience to them nor fall by disregarding them. The authority of the ethical and spiritual can be neither gainsaid nor questioned.

Now what does the ethical nature of man affirm? Does it affirm the reality of that only which is not contradicted by the cosmical? Does it hold its affirmations of the reality and worth of any truth or principle subject to the confirmation of the cosmical? Or, does it affirm to be real and true and binding that which rests upon its own testimony, and upon the testimony of what is in essence akin to itself—the testimony of God to man? Certainly upon the latter. There is no fact or principle of the ethical life which is not in appearance opposed and contradicted by the material and physical. In matter man cannot discover spirit; in living breathing forms he sees no shaping and sustaining hand; an inviolable law brings to birth and brings to death. Yet he affirms that God is. The material world opens itself

before him in a series of unfoldments to which he can discover neither beginning nor end ; it declares itself eternal. Yet on the basis of faith in God the moral reason refuses to accept the testimony of the physical, and declares that in the beginning God created all things, and that He will finally judge all things. No rule of right and wrong, no precept of the moral law holds good when applied to the vegetable or animal. The waves know no rights of property, no sanctity of life. Earthquake, cyclone, fire stand not upon questions of equity and justice ; they show no mercy ; they have no pity. Yet in this world whose ruling forces, whose countless forms of existences bear no witness to the reality of right, and bear no witness to the reality of wrong, man stands and affirms himself amenable to the moral law. Can there be a fact more unquestionable than the fact of death ? What is there that endures ? All things perish. There is the scent of death in the fragrance of the flower. We hear a requiem in the wind that sweeps through the netted branches of the forest tree. The shadow of the tomb lies upon the cradle. The pallor of the old man's cheek shows the chill of the coming night. Daily the funeral winds its sorrowful way through our streets. The hill-side is white with sepulchres. Yet in the face of this indisputable fact man stands and affirms that death is not the end of life. Pestilence may sweep away its myriads, and famine devastate whole nations, and battle reddens the fields with slaughter ;—it matters not. In the face of the fact that the world is one great charnel-house, that the earth everywhere tells of death and nowhere gives sensible token of a future life, man affirms that his life does not end when the earthly framework of his body perishes ; he waives aside the terrible testimony of physical nature and declares himself immortal. Along whatever lines of the moral and spiritual we go, this strange contradiction is found ; and the more rigidly the reason seeks along the line of the empirical to find satisfactory explanation, the wider the chasm grows. Physical nature, considered simply as a combination of material forces which make themselves known in phenomena perceived by the senses, can give no

answer but one that contradicts the holiest aspirations and profoundest needs of man.*

It is necessary for us, however, to look still deeper into the nature of testimony before we can give our judgment of the worth of the evidences furnished us by materialism. The reason is confronted with an order of facts and principles borne witness to by the sensible, material universe. But the reason does not receive an impress from the material world as a tablet from a pen; neither does it reflect in consciousness an image of the physical world. By a power distinctly its own, and in accordance with its own inherent nature, it translates the impressions received from the material world into perceptions, which are in turn combined in conceptions, on the basis of which it builds up its systems. It is by this inward power that every science is formed; and science, as the systematic apprehension of the relation of facts, and the laws governing them, partakes of the character of a mental creation. The reason thus becomes the final testimony in consciousness of the form and order and nature of the physical universe. Though there is real adaptability of the reason to apprehend the world without as it is, yet it is the conception formed by the reason which man accepts as the true world for him.†

* "So long as we confine ourselves to the material we are on safe ground, and so long as we confine ourselves to the mental we are on safe ground; but any attempt to represent a transition from physical to psychological laws, or conversely, brings us face to face with the inconceivable." *Outline of Psychology*, by Harold Höffding, p. 56. "Concerning the inner relation between mind and matter, we teach nothing; we suppose only that one being works in both. But what kind of being is this? Why has he a double form of manifestation? Why does not one form suffice? These are questions which lie beyond the realm of our knowledge. Mind and matter appear to us an irreducible duality, just as subject and object." *Ib.*, p. 67.

† In discussing the relation of minds to other things, Mr. William James, Professor of Psychology in Harvard University, affirms: "It is a thorough-going dualism. It (psychology) supposes two elements, mind knowing and thing known, and treats them as irreducible. Neither gets out of itself or into the other; neither in any way is the other, neither makes the other. They just stand face to face in a common world, and one simply knows, or is known unto its counterpart. This singular relation is not expressed in any lower terms,

The mind is, however, confronted by a second order of facts and principles, which are not directly borne witness to by the sensible, material universe. This second order of facts and principles is immaterial and super-sensuous, not holding in the world of material phenomena, nor resting for final verification on its testimony. To this order belong the great ethical and spiritual facts and principles—God, responsibility to God, holiness, righteousness, justice, faith, hope, love and their opposites—sin, disobedience, injustice, unbelief, despair, hatred. These are eternal, veritable principles and facts, more real and more firmly established than any of the facts and principles which man sensibly apprehends. These eternal facts and principles are not manifested to the senses. They are not even primarily accepted on the basis of the reason. They are affirmations of or translated into any more intelligible name. Some sort of *signal* must be given by the thing to the mind's brain, or the knowing will not occur. We find, as a matter of fact, that the mere existence of a thing outside the brain is not sufficient cause for our knowing it; it must strike the brain in some way, as well as be there, to be known. But the brain being struck, the knowledge is constituted by a new construction that occurs in the mind." "Psychology," Vol. I, p. 219.

"There is no alternative but to affirm that to perceive the universe we must construct it in thought, and that our knowledge of the universe is but the mind's inner nature. . . . By describing the mind as a waxen tablet, and things as impressing themselves upon it, we seem to get great insight until we think to ask where this extended tablet is, and how things stamp themselves on it, and how the perceptive act would be explained even if they did. . . . All talk of pictures, impressions, etc., ceases because of the lack of all the conditions to give such figures any meaning. . . . Nervous signs are the raw material of all knowledge of the outer world according to the most decided realism. But in order to pass beyond these signs into a knowledge of the outer world, we must provide an interpreter who shall read back these signs into their objective meaning. But that interpreter again must implicitly contain the meaning of the universe within itself; and these signs are but excitations which cause the soul to unfold what is within itself. Inasmuch as by common consent the soul communicates with the outer world, and never comes nearer to the object than such signs can bring it, it follows that the principles of interpretation must be in the mind itself, and that the resulting construction is primarily only an expression of the mind's own nature." B. P. Browne, Metaphysics, pp. 407-10, quoted by Prof. James, "Psychology," Vol. I, pp. 220-1.

the moral and spiritual nature, which assert themselves within the soul and compel acknowledgment. Obedience to their mandate is a fundamental need of the man, the highest and the deepest need. This obligation he cannot deny. The ethical, as evidencing itself in the life of humanity, is a testimony from without him of the truth of the moral which he sees within him. Unfulfilled, his whole life shrinks, and his joys are dissipated. Denied, he falls from his better self and becomes brutish; confusion and madness come upon him. More and more the man recognizes that his true life is ethical and religious. He recognizes that in this direction the demands of his own nature are imperious; that he violates these demands at his peril; that he fulfills them to his own highest good. Yet, further, in a mysterious way the physical world is so linked with man that when he rises, it rises also; and when he falls, it declines. As exemplified in art, in manufacture, in agriculture, in horticulture, in the training of animals, that which in nature is highest and best only comes to light through the dominion of man. Let him abandon the horse, and if it does not perish it degenerates, loses its speed, power, beauty, sagacity. So also when he abandons the fruit, the grain, the tree, the flower, they become wild, insipid, valueless. That with the advent of the purest, religious and moral life there should be a wondrous unfolding of the multiplied forces and beauties of the physical, springs from the inherent relation of man to his world. In the highest civilization the physical universe ascends, coming under the rule of the spiritual, which, with ever-increasing clearness, it is made to express. With the decline of the moral and intellectual, the wild, chaotic forces are released from their rightful authority, and, powerless to maintain himself, man sinks into servitude to them. The savage and the wilderness are always found together; and no matter to what heights of moral and intellectual sublimity the man ascends, with the decline of the moral and intellectual the wilderness returns: and the intellectual always declines when the moral gives way.

Holding, now, to the position that the reason is the witness

in consciousness of reality, whether that reality meets man's need for systematic apprehension of the material universe, or meets the deeper and stronger need that is felt for the fulfillment of the moral, which of these two circles of truth is to be for him of supreme importance? Is he to accept the testimony of his own mind to the principles and facts of the material, and not accept the testimony of his own spirit to the principles and facts of the ethical and religious? Man has made answer by refusing to accept the testimony of the physical and material, when such testimony contradicts the deep-seated and imperious affirmations of its moral and religious nature. For him those affirmations have had the most intense reality. For him they have held the throne of supreme authority. So, in opposition to the testimony of the physical universe, which gives no sensible token of God, of right and wrong, of holiness and sin, of judgment and a life to come, he stands and affirms their absolute truth. His conception of these great facts and principles, though modified to some extent by the study of the natural world, remains intrinsically unchanged. The conception of God which has evidenced itself to heart and mind as true through thought and revelation, refuses to be changed by any of the results of science. No uncovering of the processes of nature, of the seemingly inviolable law by which it is what it is, has altered his profound belief in God's providence. No statements of the evolutionist have dimmed the sense of responsibility to Him, or taken the sting out of sin, or dethroned right or enthroned wrong. These conceptions of the moral reason remain what they were, and must so remain so long as reason is true to itself. When it denies the reality of the principles of its deeper life, and accepts only the testimony of the sensibly manifest, then truly the moral will cease to have authority. Then the whole order of social life will become in the present, as over and over again in the past, the open testimony of the wrong that has been done; and a fall will ensue the like of which the world, so far as history records, has never seen before. No conception of cause and effect, as obtained by the study of

the material and sensuous ; no facts, however sustained by evidences of empirical science, can overthrow the grand fundamentals of ethics and religion, for they are based on facts also —facts which reveal in man that which distinctly marks him as man—facts which are the revelation of that which is the root and blossom of his highest welfare and happiness.

The question arises, Can the results of materialistic science and ethical science be harmoniously adjusted ? When the question is examined closely, it resolves itself into the same question of the relation of the physical to the moral which the pagan philosophers of classic times abandoned. They, too, conceived of a process of evolution as an explanation of the universe, seeking in that process the solution of the problem of life. It must be remembered that for the conception of this principle and its true philosophical investigation, the vast array of facts presented by modern science is by no means necessary. The survey of the common facts at hand in the environment of the average human life are enough to suggest the theory. Once the theory has been formed, the problem is before the philosopher and he can investigate it, metaphysically, in all its bearings. So true is this, that it is not improbable that Christian philosophy has already anticipated all the questions with which evolution may confront it. As yet, some of its most devoted expounders content themselves with speaking of it, not as a law, but as a theory ; while others go so far as to tell us that evolution is still on trial. Even if new problems arise in the future, there can be no adjustment which denies the fundamental principles of ethics. There can be no adjustment which makes the physical and material the standard of measurement of the spiritual and ethical. While the two are most intimately related, and mutually condition each other, yet the ethical is the expression of a force without parallel in the physical ; for spirit is *sui generis*.

In contemplating the world of material phenomena in its strictly spacial forms and relations, the reason is confronted by an endless series of effects and causes, in which, however far

into the remote past it goes, it never finds the first cause. Reason must take its departure from the affirmation of a first cause. Yet limiting itself strictly to the testimony of sensuous experience, even assuming a first cause, the reason never mounts into the sphere of the spiritual and attains a conception of God. Even when to the affirmation of a first cause the predicates of power and wisdom, so far as they are displayed in adjustment to a definite end, are added, reason is still unable to rise logically to the conception of God. It is only when the conceptions of the strictly scientific reason is reinforced from the side of the ethical, that reason mounts to the throne of Him from whom all things proceed. Even this does not round out the picture; it needs also the aesthetical for completeness. The conception of the personal God is the outcome of the personal in man in its entirety, and this conception is partial and broken in the degree that any element of personality is inactive in its formation. One follows M. Janet with ever-increasing interest as he traces out the indubitable evidences of cause and effect as indicative of design, only, however, to find in the end an impassable gulf between the world and God, which he can cross only on the basis of the affirmation of the moral reason. The reason has never, either in antiquity or modern times, been able to get beyond the declaration of the Scriptures: "By faith we know that the worlds were made by the word of God, so that things which are seen were not made of things which do appear." Every attempt at purely intellectual demonstration has resulted in some form of dualism between God and matter, or in some form of pantheism,—conclusions which Christian philosophy has unfailingly rejected as directly contradicting, not simply the word of the Scriptures, but its deepest intentions of truth and its most satisfactory reasons.

It has been claimed that in this the science of the physical finds a stronger and more staple ground than ethics and theology, inasmuch as it can fall back upon sensible testimony for verification. But all knowledge of the material world, as well as all knowledge of the spiritual, is gained on the basis of certain

primary intuitions, which, however verified by experiences, are in their origin undemonstrable by material science, or by the most abstract metaphysics, or by the two combined. How the mind arrives at the intuition of cause, of identity, of time and of space has never been explained. Whether the subject be approached from the side of sensuous experience, or from that of physiological psychology or spiritual psychology, every attempt to explain how these intuitions have been arrived at has proved a total failure. They are affirmations of the reason, unproved and unprovable, except that in the use of them they everywhere meet the needs of thought; and they so meet the needs of thought that without them thinking is impossible. It is undoubtedly true, as Dr. Harris states in his "Philosophic Basis of Theism," that not only morals and religion, but also all the physical sciences, come ultimately to ground themselves on faith.

Modern materialism does not get beyond these difficulties, and cannot get beyond them. It simply assumes a beginning wholly involved in the physical. There is a force in matter which evolves the world. For Mr. Spencer this material force is the source of all things. It is impersonal, it moves without thought, without design, and ultimately evolves that which is personal, which thinks and which designs. Mr. Spencer does not get beyond God; he simply links Him, or identifies Him, with physical nature, and gives Him a new name; he calls Him "Power." His god is blind and deaf and dumb, unconscious, unreasoning, yet fatal in his movements. To imagine for one moment that human reason will ever be content to rest on such an assumption is absurd. With certainty, thought will be driven from the physical to the metaphysical, from the study of the phenomena of the material and sensuous to the consideration of the spiritual and super-sensuous, from the study of the world to the study of God; and with almost fatal certainty by its conception of God it will determine its view of the world. It will be compelled to do so if it hopes to be consistent.

So, however modified may be our views of God's method of

creating, sustaining and developing manhood; all conceptions formed on the basis of the physical process must ultimately be brought into subordination to those conceptions of right and wrong which the moral reason demands. Human responsibility, sin, guilt, righteousness, faith, hope, charity, and the more specific principles of the moral life will remain, bearing testimony of their reality in consciousness largely, if not wholly, independent of the declarations of science. They are too profoundly real, they are too thoroughly supported by reason, too well confirmed by the Scriptures to be essentially modified. As no discoveries of science in the past have in any manner changed the faith of the Christian philosopher, there is no reason for fearing that it can be done in the future. As in the past the conclusions of science have been adjudged from the throne of the ethical and religious, so evolution must come to the throne of the ethical and religious for final adjudication.

It is not simply that science must be judged from the throne of the moral; all true thinking is only made possible on the basis of belief in God. So fundamental is this premise to thought that every science lacks beginning, coherence and definite end apart from it. And any attempt to bring into unity the divergent elements of thought cannot but fail if they are viewed as things apart in themselves, having no inherent relation to one another in the purpose of an absolutely wise, powerful and holy being. Much more, when we turn to study the essential elements of human nature and the principles on which the social fabric rests, will it be found that they lose all true meaning if disjointed from faith in God as their source and end. It is as utterly vain to attempt to think consistently on any other basis with reference to motives and ends of conduct, as it would be useless for the scientist to attempt to construct a system of thought while denying the reality and worth of the great primary intuitions of the reason. As all human learning comes eventually to have an ethical relation, it cannot be otherwise than that faith in God is fundamental to all right thinking, no matter in what sphere it moves nor what direction it takes.

One need only turn to the pages of Mr. Spencer's "Data of Ethics" and read over his analysis of the virtues to find that, when he has completed his effort to give them their place in his scheme, they have lost every essential element of goodness and have been degraded to merely temporary expedients. As our Lord is the revelation of God to the world, it follows, then, that every science, every principle of truth must come finally to His throne for judgment.

V.

THE SCIENTIFIC METHOD.

BY PROF. C. W. R. CRUM, COLLEGEVILLE, PA.

[Address delivered April 4, 1894.]

ABOUT a decade ago a statue of Sir Edward Jenner in Trafalgar Square, London, was to be taken down, and that of some petty naval hero of Britain put in its place. Thus, in less than a century after a man's great work would short-sighted policy eclipse the honor due his memory. Jenner showed himself a man of modest, patient, scientific perseverance. Quiet in manner, and rural in tastes, he was not a man to push his way in the world. Vaccination, the fruit of his labor, has been a priceless boon to humanity. Cultured men have maligned his name and work; but exact science and unprejudiced truth have forever set at rest the question of the high character of the work, and the no less high character of the man.

Previous to Jenner's time, almost every one had small-pox some time in his life. So universally prevalent was this disease, that it has been said, that, if some ancient citizen of the last century should rise up in modern London, the comforts and conveniences, with all the customs and manners of the present age, would not afford a more striking contrast with his own day, than the absence of faces marked by small-pox.

Jenner had noticed as early as 1775 that dairymen, who had contracted cow-pox, the vaccine disease, did not take small-pox. After twenty years of careful and repeated observation, he became convinced that vaccination would prevent, or, at least, favorably modify the course of small-pox.

Eminent men discouraged him, and some opposed him so

bitterly that it was the beginning of the present century before the practice of vaccination was fairly begun. Then it quickly spread over Europe. Jenner was hailed as a deliverer. On the continent of Europe his birthday was celebrated as a day of rejoicing. Spain sent out an expedition to carry vaccination to her colonies. Later on Napoleon granted to the name of Jenner what he had refused to other Englishmen, the release of his countrymen. It is a shame for England that she has allowed jealousy and indifference, if not ingratitude, to deprive this great man of his just income during life, and his proper honor after death.

Upward of a quarter of a century ago, a scientist of France from the recesses of his laboratory enunciated a new theory. "Fermentation," said he, "according to the old theory, is a process correlative with death, and depends on decay of albuminous matter; according to the new one, it is correlative with life, that is, the active growth and development of fungous vegetation. The yeast globules are actual living vegetable cells capable of producing the transformation of sugar."

This announcement declared a revolution. The same French scientist soon devised means for destroying the fungous vegetation, called yeast; and fermentation could thus be checked in any stage. Wines and champagnes could be prevented from souring, and enormous sums of money were saved to the wine-making districts.

This was but a beginning. It was easily perceived that there was an analogy between the phenomena of fermentation and those of infectious diseases. Examination of the blood of animals suffering from splenic fever revealed the presence there of rod-like bodies, micro-organisms, called bacteria. The energetic brain and watchful eye of this same scientist now considered closely the changes of these micro-organisms. These rod-like bodies were seen to break up into beads. These latter proved to be germs, seed as it were, for new rods. Growing these germs in proper culture fluid, they became bacteria again; and animals poisoned with this fluid developed splenic fever. Here,

then, he held the disease in a little fluid in a test tube. Here were a few drops from Pandora's box held under cover of a plug of cotton.

Thousands of cattle were dying in Europe in each epidemic of this disease. Men were affected too; some died, and others suffered grievous crops of boils. Now in the light of Jenner's work, cow-pox, the vaccine disease, is nothing more than attenuated small-pox. The same laboratory, or rather the same active mind and hand that worked there, succeeded in weakening the virulence of splenic fever germs, and with these weakened germs a mild form of that disease could be made to supersede the regular epidemic. Thus a great plague was stayed, and almost stamped out, just as small-pox had been.

It was noticed, however, that a middle field was necessary for the growth of the bead-like germs into bacteria between the successive epidemics of this disease. Strange to say, the common earth-worm was found to be the culture medium. In the bodies of these earth-worms,—the fish baits of our boyhood,—these germs developed, were cast out into the dust, and, years after, on the same pasture land, another epidemic of splenic fever prevailed.

This disease was one of the plagues of Pharaoh. In the third verse of the ninth chapter of Exodus, a grievous murrain is threatened to the cattle of Egypt. It came, and all the cattle of the Egyptians died. There is every evidence that this murrain was splenic fever. Later on again, Moses and Aaron scattered upon the winds the dust of the field, and "it became a boil upon man and upon beast." The earth-worm, meanwhile, had multiplied the germs into myriads.

Truly the labor of this nineteenth century scientist has borne fruit. Thousands of cattle and sheep are now saved to Europe annually. Mankind is saved from suffering and death.

Now in the year 1865 alone, the disease of the silk-worm, known as Pebrine, caused a loss to the silk industry of France of twenty millions of dollars. The same laboratory, the same mind was at work again and came out victorious. The parasite

of the silk-worm could be stamped out. The looms of France and Italy were again set in motion. As to the money value of this discovery, Tyndall estimated that the saving to the silk industry of France from 1872 to 1882 would, in large measure, have paid the Franco-Prussian War indemnity.

Such an estimate of the money value of a scientific discovery makes greater impression upon us than the saving of human life, or the example of such men, watching and weighing, measuring, toiling more than we appreciate, to save wearing work, but, even more, to bring salvation to the race from pain and physical ailment.

It has long been a problem to my mind, if, in the divine plan of salvation, deliverance from physical labor could be included. Just as in the curse came the physical condemnation that "in the sweat of the brow should man eat bread," so, in the spread of divine light and salvation from the great central Life and Light, there should not be worked out in labor-saving machinery, perhaps, a final salvation from exhausting work, leaving for man a directive power only to employ the material forces as his servants, by them and with them to serve humanity and the Creator more acceptably. Might we dream that, eventually, there could be, with all this, an absolute salvation from physical death too?

Micro-organisms have been found in putrefaction, in suppuration, and in various diseases. These germs, bacteria and micro-cocci are found swarming everywhere, in water, in air, in all kinds of organic matter. From these researches into microbe life have come new ideas of disease, new methods of treatment, and the antiseptic method of surgery; while sanitation, a comparatively new science, has developed wonderful proportions.

The illustrious Frenchman to whose mind the light of these things was first revealed, is Pasteur—one of the heroes of the century, a more than rival for the German Bismarck. Bismarck may have brought salvation and glory to the German people; Pasteur has brought physical salvation to French and German alike, and the glory will not be so much to France or

to Pasteur, but the thanksgiving of a world delivered from its woe will arise up in glory to the Throne of all Grace.

I have cited the life-work of these two men as illustrative of the subject at hand—the Scientific Spirit and Method.

The scientific method is becoming the animus of modern life. It is a method which directs one to prove all things, to discard the evil, to hold fast to the good. From the narrow limits to which the word science is often confined, it is growing as a leaven, it tends to step out into every domain, even into daily life.

Nor does the Scientific Method obtain its place without opposition. Ignorance, that supreme servant of evil, would draw a cloud to hide the fair countenance; envy would besmirch her clean vesture; prejudice, precedent, conservatism, idleness, the spirit which the French call *laissez faire*, all combine against the claims of this new way.

The most essential quality of the Scientific Method is exactness. It means measurements precise, and rules without exception. Its second prominent feature is the right, and, at the same time, the necessity to derive and verify for one's self. It is to seek and to work out one's own salvation without priestly or pedagogic authority excepting that such authority may furnish implements for the labor, and communicate the art of their use, so far as successful in other hands. It is a liberty in which one is called upon to stand fast.

Such are, on the one hand, the general appearance, and, on the other, the very framework of our subject. It would clothe itself with exact truth as with a garment, and its outlines bespeak the individual right of investigation.

The Scientific Method makes use of reasoning both inductive, from facts to principles; and deductive, from principles to facts. Its line of work is as follows: With care to observe what occurs, with honesty to collate and winnow the data, with the aid of constructive imagination to formulate a satisfactory theory, with perseverance to test thoroughly, with humility to receive repeated rebuke for human imperfections, with energy

to renew the work, with faith to maintain the law now rendered extremely probable, in triumph to predict the future.

In the first place, to observe carefully and to test thoroughly require a well-fitted workshop and skilled workmen. Hand-craft here plays an important part. Handcraft, too, contributes to proper physical, mental and moral development. Dr. Gilman, in the *Cosmopolitan* for last month, writes: "It may be considered as demonstrated that health and beauty walk hand in hand with skill and strength, while scholarship and learning are not excluded from this vigorous companionship." Trade schools, manual training schools are slowly getting their own, and there is evidence that the preparatory schools of the future will require manual training in some form. But we need more exact work and more exact thought than these afford. The laboratory is refined trade.

Here master workmen weigh to the one-millionth part of a pound, they measure to the five hundred-thousandth of an inch, compute time to the one-thousandth of a second, analyze the sun and stars, calculate distances to millions times millions of miles, number the atoms in a tear drop by the trillions, reckon the forces of a Corliss Engine, of a rushing planet or of a fly's wing, observe microbes how they grow, and discover new worlds of life and activity.

What do men outside of a laboratory know of its workings? Less than nothing. It does not enter into their minds to conceive of its careful, accurate work.

Prolonged accuracy is another expression for difficulty. It is so much easier to sit and theorize over these things. What need has the master mind of man to work out these details, when it may sit as lord and build its own system of creation? This system can perfect itself, and thinks to see itself enthroned in splendor. It wages war on conflicting doctrines. It tries for schism, and passes condemnation. The imagination, the Quixotic in man, is delighted with this play, and wins the fierce contests, charging now an inn, and now a wind-mill, in the vain conceit that they are castles or giants of evil. For our

modern Don Quixotes, giants and castles have arisen in science, impregnable truly to their assaults; but, to enlightened eyes, the fancied giants and castles are plainly useful and hospitable servants. Let us hope that these ambitious relics of chivalrous days gone by may cease their folly of breaking goose-wing lances, and rest from their labors.

Nothing lends conceit so readily as a human doctrine, be it an old woman's maxim or a religious dogma. As Lowell said, "Men approach truth from the circumference, and, acquiring a knowledge at most of one or two points of that circle of which God is the centre, are apt to assume that the fixed point from which it is described is that where they stand."

Men who seek truth in a well-fitted laboratory and by careful experiment, learn how much error and falsehood lie in the human hand or eye, and in the human mind as well. Men who theorize, often cannot see that they are wrong, and sometimes will not see. As George Eliot pictures Causabon, they wander with their "small taper of learned theory amid the tossed ruins of the world," wander, taper in hand, and imagine that, as a sun, they order and illumine the whole.

Not as a master, but as a child, may one seek to learn the hidden secrets of nature. Permit two quotations from able scientists: first, "The humblest man on earth will be found in a physical laboratory;" and secondly, "It is unworthy of an intelligent being to trifle with the works of the Creator. A laboratory of natural history is a sanctuary in which nothing improper should be exhibited." Humility, then, and reverence are the qualities of mind with which a student may approach the sanctuary of truth. Add to these perseverance and faith in the plain evidences of nature. Le Verrier pinned his reputation to his faith when he wrote to the observatory of Berlin to point their telescope to a particular part of the heavens, and that there would be found a new planet; and yet Newton was ready to discard his theory of universal gravitation for twenty years, until more accurate measurements proved his theory a law.

The educational value of the laboratory, as the laboratory

should be, under the direction of a proper scientific spirit, no one can question. Education is character building, development of manhood, of the noblest attributes of manhood. To work, to serve if you please, is the highest office and the greatest freedom. Education is not forced memory-cram. It is awakened interest, if not enthusiasm; in the end, it is philanthropy.

The wonderful economy in the natural world teaches prudence; it teaches to give and take, to press and to yield. The all-pervading law of transformation and conservation of energy is a lecture on social economy and finance, and innumerable topics besides. You know the laity sometimes think that theological men should have a few lectures on finance.

To interpret the result of observation calls for an honest brain. Figures sometimes lie, statistics often lie, and statistics are very often made to lie. An honest man does honest work, and attains trustworthy results; and yet, withal, for the reason that he is honest, he shall ever hold the work of his hands, the work of his reason, the work of his imagination, all subject to human imperfection, short-sightedness, a certain degree of error which he may never hope to overcome entirely, but which he may lessen as he approaches nearer and nearer to the secrets of the Infinite. This is the humility of a scientific spirit. It is neither groveling, uncertain, nor despairing. It does not crush out courage in any well-founded opinion, but it is fatal to intellectual pride.

Absolute exactness is a thing impossible, a thing unknown and unknowable. This is no reason that faith should accept appearances without testing to the utmost. One may reach results which are exact in so far that the limit and probability of error may be determined. Natural laws know no exceptions. An acceptable theory must therefore explain all known phenomena. But when theory predicts events day after day, year after year, century after century, probability becomes certainty, and theory becomes law.

Laboratory work, as it should be, is not play, and a slight

taste of hard work is not always to be made sweet. An exhibition to dazzle the eyes and delight the sense of the wonderful is not laboratory work. It may give a better conception of what is doing in this way; it may popularize the work, and introduce its claims; but, as an active agency in character building, the laboratory must be given some sway. What would be the value of a course in Latin, consisting of two or three hours a week for one year? A good laboratory course demands time, and its proper equipment requires money; but even with a moderate amount much may be accomplished.

Unfortunately we are asked to teach the sciences from text books alone, and especially in this manner to teach physics, that science which embraces the widest domain, is theoretical, and hard to understand above all other experimental sciences, and yet that which is probably contributing most to the development of modern civilization. To teach physics, or chemistry, or biology from text book alone, may be an exercise to the student's memory; but it is little more. The subject loses its savor and beauty, while the student's ideas even of the simplest phenomena are ill defined and often false. Those high qualities of character, which are to be developed in a hand-to-hand grappling with scientific problems, are not brought out at all; and, still worse, this teaching may produce a very different mental development. If not warned of the danger, the student may accept blindly any opinion on the least show of authority, whilst his mind is apt to grow narrow and prejudiced. Theory becomes dogma, and a clever guess or a half truth is certainty to such a mind. It is willing to follow any arbitrary standard; and yet it rushes to the other extreme, poses for effect, is arrogant and impudent to those who are ignorant, or who dare to doubt. In an incredibly short space of time, it unites intellectual pride, conceit, scorn, and a slavery to the printed page. The dictionary has it so. To be sure, dictionaries are infallible.

It has been affirmed that the most important object of education is independence. As previously intimated, the very outlines of the scientific method bespeak freedom of thought

and action. It was this change in method which marked the rise of modern civilization. The revival of letters, the invention of printing, the discovery of America, the reformation of religion were but the first upheavals due to a powerful force just breaking out from beneath the surface. That force was the growing feeling that the right to know is universal, that each one has a right to try for one's self, to test the truth as it appears to every honest mind. It was a force of mind, the ever-widening force of life, seeking for new fields to conquer.

The Romish Church sought to crush and confine this new energy, which might oppose her indolence and arrogance, and divulge the arcana of her holy decrees. Ever politic, as the flood grew stronger and irrepressible, she attempted to turn aside the stream, to direct it into other channels, to pollute it, to use it for her own purposes. What she could not direct, she sought to persecute out of existence. Thus the Romish Church laid herself liable to the charge that she has been foster-mother of ignorance, one might say of ignorance and of war, the child of ignorance.

So far as education was concerned, the greatest side channel into which this rising current could be diverted was afforded by the study of ancient classics. These literary models furnished a vast field which could be worked over, again and again, with little advance. Books could be made and their writing effaced to make new ones, and the continuous round consumed time, wasted force, and took the place of original research. This suited well the Romish polity; so that Romish schools, and especially the Jesuits, have ever defended and favored "The Humanities." To declaim Latin odes or compose Latin poems made a great display of learning, was least likely to create schism, and did no one harm. Now the Humanities are excellent mental drill; but it is an exercise much of the nature of marking time; there is little forward movement. Investigations, searching out the secrets of the universe of nature, as well as seeking to know the true meaning, religious and social, of divine revelation, in the Word and in the world, were forbidden things.

The flagrant abuses of the Church, and the plain perversion of the Scriptures brought the latter question to an issue, and the Reformation followed. But her policy and prejudices in regard to many social questions, and especially respecting her attitude toward scientific research, and the method which it entails, Rome succeeded in many respects in transferring to the Protestant division of the Church.

Luther declared that the creation was an instantaneous act. "Moses," said he, "spoke properly and plainly and neither allegorically or figuratively." "The world with all its creatures was created in six days." With Luther, Peter Martyr and the Westminster Confession held this belief an essential article of faith. Michael Servetus was burned in Geneva, when perhaps ready to announce to the world the great discovery which, made again three-fourths of a century later, immortalized the name of Harvey. How many poor souls saw their life blood ebb away which might have been stayed had they but had proper knowledge of the circulation of the blood!

Years before that time Roger Bacon pierced the darkness of guessing and groping, as a beam of light. As early as the thirteenth century, he had arraigned the false methods of his time. He recognized the necessity of mathematical exactness, and designated experimental science, "*Domina omnium scientiarum*," the queen of all sciences. He was charged with prosecuting the black art, banished, confined and forbidden to write books.

Giordani Bruno, brilliant and erratic, had proposed in effect the nebular hypothesis. The Inquisition burned him at the stake in Rome in the year 1600, and the theory seemed buried with his ashes.

The next hundred years saw the persecutions of five great scientists—Copernicus, Kepler, Galileo, Des Cartes and Newton. The Inquisition dogged and harassed the first three, Des Cartes feared to publish his researches, and Newton escaped with little more than written abuse. But the end of the century

witnessed their triumph. The relations of the solar system, the motions of the planets, and the laws governing them were questions settled forever.

The long periods of creation, as evidenced by the study of geology, the nebular hypothesis, and the later doctrine of evolution have remained as stumbling blocks to this day. But the time is past when experimental science presents itself as a suppliant for permission to exist. We no longer do penance, fast, and exhort the holy Church to deliver us from an epidemic of typhoid fever; we disinfect refuse and clean sewers, hog pens and wells. Strange to say the modern means are the more effectual, and we thank God that He has revealed to us the way of escape. I believe truly that the spirit which yearns and seeks humbly, honestly and with strength for the truth in all things, whether you call it the scientific spirit or not, is the spirit of light, the spirit of regeneration, the Spirit of Christ. Newton was charged with substituting "Gravitation for Providence;" but a spirit, such as this, in no way detracts from the honor to God, nor from a proper faith in His written Word.

Professor Helmholtz said in a recent lecture, "There has been more accomplished by science during the last two centuries than during the two thousand years previously." While the discoveries in Biology, Geology, Chemistry and Astroouomy have added much to the world's knowledge, none have had so great influence upon its life and civilization as the revelations in what is more particularly the domain of Physical Science, and of Physical Art or Technology. We need but instance the three successive ages—the age of mechanical appliances simply, the age of steam, the age of electricity.

America has been lagging behind in the advancement of scientific and technical training. "As a national question," said Professor Thurston, in the opening address of the World's Fair discussion of this subject, "technical education and technological schools constitute for us the most important of all current topics and subjects in connection with educational work

and development in this country." "The magnitude of the demand for technical instruction is greater than is usually supposed, and the real need—which vastly exceeds the demand—is far beyond the ordinary estimates of even the educator engaged in this special work. . . . We have hardly made a beginning in the building of that great system of industrial training, supplementing education, which must, if we are to survive in the industrial rivalry of the nations, soon be made to constitute an important and extensive division of the state and of the national educational structure."

It is stated by Whewell that, "the opening of Greek civilization was marked by the production of geometry, the idea of space brought to a scientific precision; and likewise the opening of modern European civilization was distinguished by the production of a new mathematical science, Mechanics, which soon led to the mechanics of the heavens, and this step, like the former, depended on men arriving at a properly distinct fundamental idea, the idea of force."

Here we notice, that no science becomes exact without a strong framework of Mathematics. To count, and weigh, and measure, and outline accurately is at the basis of all scientific work. Mathematics lends accuracy and points to all knowledge of exterior things from the daily affairs of life to the most difficult problems of Mechanics, Electricity or Thermo-dynamics. The theories of Infinitesimals and Probability have been finger-posts of modern investigation. Mathematics goes immensely further—even to discuss the deepest metaphysical questions, such as limitation and shape of space; it proposes and discusses hyperspace. To use the words of a prominent educator, "When we reflect that hardly any branch of knowledge is so depreciated by the average man as the modern advancement of pure mathematics, we must believe that its influence upon civilization is not sufficiently considered."

What are technical training and scientific discoveries worth to us in a monetary way? The question can hardly be answered.

Their value is so great that one cannot have an adequate notion of it. As for valuable scientific appliances used in the industrial arts, their name is legion. The steam railway and telegraph have given us, as a nation, that backbone which Napoleon said this country would lack as having no great military roads. Immense fortunes, too, are wrapped up in the telephone, steamships, electric lighting and electric railways, with fabulous promises for the future.

Hygiene and sanitation contribute largely to wealth. A healthy man works, while a sick man makes work. It has been estimated that the fearful epidemic of yellow fever, some years ago in Memphis and the Mississippi valley, cost more than the most destructive fire this country has known, the great fire of Chicago.

That is, however, a gross view which reckons only the money value of science. We can always rely on the selfishness of man to make use of all means at hand to gain money, to grasp power over his fellow. The Scientific Method and the results that follow in its wake have a higher course to run. To relieve suffering, to refine and educate mankind, to promote happiness and peace are nobler ends. Sordid motives, ambition for gain and social evils seem ever at hand to take advantage of industrial advance. They tend to trammel and cramp development. Fortunately, too, the Scientific Method is not confining itself to Physics or Chemistry or Biology, and our plea is not for these alone; but the Scientific Method of study goes further, it is now applied to Psychology, even to Philology and Linguistics, to History, to Social Economy, to mankind in all his relations. Let us work and pray that it may lead to light and liberty, liberty as it only can exist, liberty sustained by highest law, the law of man made consonant to the law of Heaven. Then can be realized the idea of Pasteur as stated about a year ago on his seventieth birthday, "Science and Peace may yet triumph over Ignorance and War."

In conclusion I cannot forbear calling attention to some very recent work in Philology which came to my knowledge only

quite recently. Within the past three or four months, as Prof. Bloomfield says, "A literary event of great importance has happened—an event which is certain to stir the world of science and of culture." The Sanscrit Vedas have heretofore been regarded as dating back to a period not more than about 2500 years before Christ. Certain astronomical data contained in the Vedas, have revealed the fact that the Vernal Equinox which is now in Aries, occurred at the time of their composition, as far back as the constellation Orion. According to the precession of the equinoxes, this points to a period at least 4500 B. C., and will place the first beginnings of the Aryan race as far back as 6000 B. C. What is more remarkable in this case is that the same result has been reached simultaneously in two points geographically far apart, in Germany and in far-off Bombay, and both announcements have been made within the standing year. Speaking of the Bombay publication, Prof. Bloomfield says, "The book is unquestionably the literary sensation of the year just before us, and history, the chronic re-adjuster, will have her hands uncommonly full to assimilate the result of Tilak's discovery and arrange her paraphernalia in the new perspective."

How the church will receive the claims of these philologists remains to be seen, and yet the evidence in this case seems exceedingly strong. It is but an illustration of how the scientific method ventures on ground hitherto forbidden.

Pre-eminently, then, we need in education to make use of the Scientific Method, and we need such training in that direction as is only properly afforded by the so-called pure sciences. We would not deify the learning of the past, nor advise to cast away entirely the treasures that come down to us from the ages. They are valuable—exceedingly rich. We need them, but we need more than these; we need a method to work; a way to labor. The end to be attained is usefulness. The fresh college man, as he has been with his horde of dry learning, often failed in this. Many can call to mind, for instance, Horace Greeley's expression, "Of all horned cattle in a news-

paper office, the worst is the college graduate." We need an earnest, living, pushing, striving activity on right principles, principles of truth and justice, for use in daily life, principles that are progressive and exactly scientific. Then whether in the dizzy whirl of business and of social gaiety, or in life exempt from public haunt, we shall have a place, and shall find harmony and truth everywhere,—

"Tongues in trees, books in running brooks,
Sermons in stones, and good in everything."

VI.

THE CULTURKAMPF IN THE GERMAN EMPIRE.*

BY C. CLEVER, D.D.

THE sublime march of empire among the German people, keeping step to that music which makes this century so glorious, is one of the most remarkable political phenomena in the Christian centuries. Bismarck and Emperor William the First stand side by side on the pedestal of honor with Charlemagne, Barbarossa, Charles the Fifth, and Frederick the Great. The rapidity with which the petty principalities of the German States were welded together into one homogeneous empire astounded the political calculations of all the nations of the Old World. The war drum had scarcely begun to sound till the cannon on a thousand hilltops proclaimed to all that Germany had become an empire, and its grandest rival was at its feet, an unwilling but earnest suppliant.

The distinguishing characteristics of this new empire, and in like manner its signal advantages over the old, were first that it was purely German. It was German not only in language, but in spirit. The watch on the Rhine never found such a loyal response as when the victorious Germans paraded the streets of Paris, to attend the crowning of the idol of the German people in one of the fashionable palaces of the kings and emperors of France. Then, again, the different parts of the empire had been welded together by bands that are stronger than steel. It

* Authorities: Geffcken—"Church and State;" Kurtz—"Church History;" Andrews—"Institutes of General History;" Griesinger—"The Jesuits;" Pressense—"Contemporary Portraits;" Lea—"History of the Inquisition."

was a powerfully centralized government. Its architects were men who could do hard pounding, and were endowed with an endurance which would not stay till the goal had been reached. A third characteristic was that it was solely political, and entirely free from all ecclesiastical alliances. Ever since Pope Leo the Third had placed the imperial crown upon the head of Charles the Great, ecclesiastical interference had been experienced in every part of the empire. There were times when the strong hand of a ruler was directed simply by the best interests of the people; but these were the exceptions and not the rule. Now all is changed. The bonds which for a thousand years bound Germany to Rome had been snapped asunder. "Thrilled with great life, Germany proceeds to outgrow the Fatherland, fretting the ocean with her merchantmen, planting colonies beyond. Germany, with her unmatched prestige; Germany, so learned and strong, so peaceable if permitted to be, so terrible if provoked; Germany, possessing resources so vast and varied, developed and undeveloped, wheels into column, with Great Britain and the United States, to forward the irresistible march of Teutonic civilization round the globe."* As early as 1861, one of the greatest historians of Germany, with true prophetic insight, said: "As certainly as rivers run to the sea, there will be formed in Germany, by the side of Austria, a limited federation under the direction of Prussia. To secure it, recourse will be had to all means of persuasion and diplomacy, but to war in case of resistance."

The rise of New Germany, and with it, and in more respects than one in consequence of it, a new Europe, required new relationships. Old treaties and agreements, however hoary with age, must be readjusted. Roman interference may be tolerated as a straw to show which way the wind is blowing; but the days of Hildebrand and Henry the Fourth have passed away, and are no more expected to return than the leafage of a forgotten summer. It is then one of the most momentous crises in all European history. "It placed the leadership of Continental

* Andrews, "Institutes of General History," 440.

Europe for the first time in the hands of a Protestant and purely Teutonic power." England and America little knew to what extent the wars of 1866 and 1870 were influenced by religion and involved religious interests. The crash of conflict must come. Papal influences, immediate and remote, would all be brought to bear upon anything that would entangle the new empire in disputes and complications which would give the least promise of making it an egregious failure.

The first great sin of Germany, in the eyes of the Curia, was to treat with Italy in its struggle for independence. It was at this time that the anger of the Pope was stirred against Germany, and his warmest benedictions bestowed upon France. It was through the influence of the Jesuits that the war between France and Germany had been fomented. In their eyes the victory at Sadowa was a triumph of heretics. Antonelli exclaimed, when the news of the triumph of German valor reached Rome : "The world is coming to an end."

Having given some account of the position of New Germany, and its sympathy with the new order of things, it is well to cast a glance at the Vatican. It will then be seen how the *Culturkampf* arose, and why it became so fierce. Gregory the XVI, Pope from 1831 to 1846, the predecessor of Pius the IX, amid the sorest trials at home and abroad, hurled defiance at the new order of things. He was an incarnation of the Hildebrandian idea and determined to throw himself athwart the pathway of all progressive steps, either in church or state. In 1832 he issued an encyclical, in which he declared irreconcilable war against modern science, against the freedom of the press, against the freedom of the conscience. His whole pontificate was a consistent carrying out of these ideas. Though stoutly opposed by liberal and revolutionary movements, as humanity was struggling up towards that goal which a divine hand has placed before it, yet he continued to resist the inevitable. In as far as he succeeded, he was encouraged by the military interference of France and Austria.

Pope Pius the IX, in 1846, was chosen to fill the chair made

vacant by the death of his predecessor. In the earlier part of his pontificate, he seemed willing to make some concessions to the new age, which was just at hand. But Italy, at least, was not to be deceived by these empty professions. The Pope was driven out of Rome (1848), and the Roman Republic was proclaimed soon after (1849). After two years he came back, and was maintained in his somewhat anomalous position by French and Austrian bayonets. The Italian revolution was the red flag which excited all the slumbering energies of the Roman Curia. Abandoning all his liberal views, the Pope put himself entirely under the influence of the Jesuits. His prime minister, Antonelli, faithfully seconded the efforts that were made to stem the rising tide of modern civilization. From this time on, Jesuitism and Catholicism mean the same thing—are synonymous terms. The end is to obtain the complete control of Church and State. The Pope and some of the governments believed that nothing but Jesuitism could save the world. The hurrying revolutions which swept all before them threatened, according to Papal thinking, Church and State with annihilation. In 1854 appeared the Bull proclaiming the sinlessness of the Virgin Mary. Ten years later Pius sent forth an encyclical, accompanied by a syllabus, in which he condemned the whole round of modern ideas. It was a Jesuitical attempt to bring into reproach freedom of conscience, speech and press, the equality of clergy and laity before the courts of the law, the separation of the State from the Church, the right of kings and princes to reign, without seeking the privilege from the Roman authorities. In short, all the political and social ideas of modern times were impaled upon the same rack, as the denial of Christ or parricide. In 1870 followed the great council, which affirmed the infallibility of the Pope. This, at first sight, seems a sort of child's play, amid the closing scenes of the nineteenth century; but to those who have eyes to see, it means the assertion of a power, the ramifications of which reach out along every line of national and ecclesiastical life. It was an ultramontane effort to incarnate the sentiments of the

syllabus, and give the Pope an opportunity to embrace at once every opening that would promise a firmer hold upon the governments of the earth. After the decree of Infallibility, he counsels with no one. He may at any moment issue a judgment, *ex cathedra*, which runs counter to all the best interests of the nations of the earth.

It is now that we have the rise of the Culturkampf in the German Empire. Germany was given to understand that all the power of the Papacy, fired by Jesuitical influence, would dog it at every step it would take in forming the new government. In a late number of a Roman Catholic magazine it is asserted, "What we now call the German Empire is scarcely a shadow of the Holy Roman Empire. The very idea of a Protestant emperor is an historical lie." When in 1866 Prussia made a league with Italy we have the first outburst of pronounced wrath from the Vatican. It was a new turn in the political fortunes of Europe for a German prince to form an alliance with a power which had been put under the ban by a papal decree. Whether it was to produce a conflict or create sympathy among the Roman Catholic powers, does not appear. A demand, however, was made for the German Emperor to reinstate the Pope in the temporal power that had slipped from his grasp never to return. The favor shown to Italy, and the ruthless shattering of the power of France, would be forgotten if this dream of Jesuitism would be accomplished by the aid of German diplomacy or German bayonets. To the followers of Loyola, it mattered not much which plan would be resorted to in order to accomplish the end. As the new empire began to move forward it found itself hampered at well nigh every point. The forces were hidden, but none the less effective in their persistent resistance. Gradually these popish mountebanks began a well-laid campaign against German interests. "They carried on their operations, at first, secretly, and concealed in secular clothing; gradually they found an entrance, in addition to princely courts, into a couple of families, as well as into a couple of cloisters, and from these into a couple of

pulpits; then they possessed themselves of one or other school classes, and after a few years they opened an educational institution; lastly, they took care that, on the one hand, the cathedral, and, on the other, the court and official appointments should be filled by their pupils; and behold, in the course of forty years, Germany was again Catholicized to the extent of two-fifths."*

In the early stage of ultramontane efforts in Germany, even the wisest statesmen were caught by the wily promises of the Jesuits. From the *annus mirabilis*, 1848 till 1860, most of the influential statesmen, including Bismarck and Emperor William, were deceived with the idea, always asserted, with such unwavering confidence, in a period of stress and storm, that the hierarchy is the only power which can steady tottering thrones, and enable governments to successfully quiet the disturbing elements which threatened to level all barriers of resistance. The hand that to-day lifts up, to-morrow proves to be a burden, that is more to be dreaded than the stormiest revolution. When Germany began to adjust itself to the new relations, the first contest is with the Jesuits. Thoroughly grounded in the Empire, with a fair show of proving their right to exist, from former favors shown to them, the conflict will be very serious. The Emperor and his Chancellor are loath to enter upon a hand-to-hand battle. For the while there is an attempt at peace; but soon the storm breaks out in terrible fury. The papal *nuncio* at Munich, in 1868, threw down the gauntlet with words that fired all the energy and love of the German people not under the influence of the Jesuits. "Only in America, England and Belgium does the Catholic Church receive its rights; elsewhere nothing can help us but the revolution." A Roman Catholic bishop, whose prominence gave his utterances a semi-official character, said, "If kings will no longer be of God's grace, I shall be the first to overthrow the throne. Only a war or revolution can help us in the end."

The question which must now be settled, once for all, is

* Griesinger, "The Jesuits," p. 338.

whether the principles of the syllabus giving conciliar authority, are to prevail in Germany, or the new ideas which have been born of ages of German travailing. Is Germany to be an annex to Rome, or shall she start out upon a career of progress and greatness which shall at first make her the wonder, and later on the admiration of the great men and mighty captains of the earth? There is hope at Rome that the former will be the course pursued. There had been such a large number of young men educated in the schools under Jesuitical influence, that might be expected to allow papalism to overcome patriotism. Unions, sodalities and congregations under the government of those who were but the tools of the Jesuits sprang up in every part of Germany, and from these might be expected a crowd of people who would obey their superiors at any cost. And besides all these, the Jesuits found in the Minister of Public Worship, Von Mühler, a tool who anticipated their wishes and championed every movement which in the least degree abetted their cause. A petition was presented to the German Emperor at Versailles, after the French Empire had fallen, and the last national stay of the Papacy had been broken, to aid the Papacy against Italy. Bismarck, however, did not give the least approval to the project. It was now that we find a party forming in the Reichstag to compel the rulers of the nation to grant the request. A party of Roman Catholics was at once formed, which, from their position in the hall, were designated as the Centre. Here we have the real *Culturkampf*. Their watch-cry was,—The government without the support of the Roman Church cannot stand. Though victory had been gained, and the last hope of Rome, supported by all the power of the Papacy and all the cunning of Jesuitism had been wiped out by German valor, yet these would-be saviours of the Fatherland shouted themselves hoarse with this senseless and stale assumption. They wanted William to go to Rome and receive at the hands of Pius IX. the imperial crown. Never did the assumption that Rome should rule the consciences, and through them the temporal affairs of mankind, find a more daring assertion

than in the efforts of the party of the Centre in the Reichstag. But never before,—possibly Luther excepted—did the Roman Catholic power find a more stubborn antagonist. Prince Bismarck's *bon mot*, "We go not to Canossa," sounds the same note as Luther's "Hier stehe Ich—Ich kann nicht anders," and it aroused anew the storm. Open war was declared against Germany. If mercenaries, which played such a prominent part in the Middle Ages, could have been procured in sufficient numbers to compete with the German army flushed with victory, and under such magnificent generals as Unser Fritz, Bismarck and Von Moltke, Europe would have been treated to one of the fiercest struggles ever carried on between hostile forces.

The leaders of the Centre, Malin Krotz, who died in 1874, Windhorst, Bishop von Ketteler, all Jesuits, or under the influence of Jesuits, which is even worse, were acting in most complete understanding with the Roman Curia. Herr von Mühler favored the appointment of all such persons as would aid the Centre in its fight against the new empire.

In the government of Germany there had been a department for the special direction of matters pertaining to the Roman Catholic Church. Thus far there had been no conflict between this and the other departments of state. But now it is to be made a force, which is to be an entering wedge to sever the union that had been formed under inspiration and patriotism. It is the head of the slimy serpent hissing, which in the end will embrace within its folds all the departments of the state.

The first serious conflict was along the line of education. Some professors and teachers, who had not submitted to the dogma of infallibility, were suspended from their positions by the bishops in whose dioceses they were engaged. The Roman Catholic authorities insisted that the support of the government should be withheld, and the interference of the Church to have full sway. It was a critical time, and questions of law were not always as carefully considered as in times of peace, and when all the machinery of government is moving with ease

and precision. There was nothing to be done but to assert the rights of citizenship in the Empire and to protect those put under the ban, even though it seemed to be passing judgment upon the doctrines of the papal decree. Bismarck had declared in 1872, "Dogmatic controversies about changes and declarations, which may have occurred within the dogma of the Catholic Church, are foreign to the government, which must hold itself aloof from them accordingly."

Though this was the position assumed by the government, yet the Papacy compelled it oftentimes to depart from it, and to cut the Gordian knot. It is true, this would oftentimes involve an apparent interference with the province of the Church. It was the necessity of the times that gave such a coloring to some of the efforts of the government. Dr. Wollman, a teacher of religion at the Gymnasium at Braunsburg, had refused to submit to the dogma of Papal Infallibility. He was, however, loyal to the government that had appointed him, and proved himself eminently qualified for the position in which he had been placed. The Bishop of Ermeland suspended him from his functions. Wollman called upon the government to protect him in his rights. This case has become somewhat celebrated, because it was a test case. The government, in face of all the protests of the Roman Catholic clergy, at home and abroad, and of the threats of the Centre, maintained the ecclesiastic in his position. It became evident that such a vigorous move required the removal of all hindrances from the imperial council board that would not heartily second the efforts of the government, even though dictated by common sense and expediency.

The first move, on the part of the government, was the abolishing of the department to which had been committed the management of Catholic Church matters. As was to be expected, this raised a storm that threatened the whole existence of the Empire. The two calmest actors in all that sublime drama of German history were William the First, still the idol of the German people, and his great chancellor, Prince Bismarck. None saw more clearly the necessity for such action than the

latter. Though patient and long-suffering, Germany or the Papacy must now be sacrificed; the wood had been gathered, the fire kindled, and none knew better than the great chancellor where the victim was to be sacrificed. The further advance, along the line so clearly marked out, and so doggedly pursued, required the removal of Herr Von Müller. When this official perceived that he had become notoriously a drag on all progressive movements, that he was no longer suitable for the new era that had arisen in Germany, and that all the liberal sections of the Parliament were determined upon voting in plain terms a want of confidence in him, he resigned. The resignation was accepted at once, and on January 22, 1872, Dr. Falk was appointed to fill the place. All Germany felt that it had been delivered from an oppression that had poisoned the sources of patriotism and power. Prince Bismarck found in the new Minister of Religious Affairs a man after his own heart. "With such a person as him, Prince Bismarck could work hand-in-hand in proceeding against clerical lust after power and the presumption of the Jesuits and ultramontanes; indeed it was precisely on this account that the imperial chancellor had effected his nomination."* In the meantime the Pope had shown some signs of contempt against Germany. Cardinal Prince Hohenlohe had been appointed ambassador at the Court of Rome. This man had remained a German throughout all the contest, and had refused to become in any way the tool of the Jesuits. Now when he comes to the Court of Rome, the Pope positively refuses to receive him as the accredited ambassador of the German Empire. This insult rested heavily upon the heart of the Emperor and Bismarck, and it is just possible that it banished the last shred of sympathy for the Pope.

It also did another thing: it confirmed the opinion of Falk and Bismarck that nothing could be done till the schools were put under such instruction as would make them German in spirit and truth. In the Polish provinces of the Empire, Count Ledochowski, whom the Pope had appointed Primate of Poland,

* Griesinger, "The Jesuits," p. 369.

was the main centre of this agitation. Here the schools had ceased to use the German language, and had used nothing but the Polish. The whole effect was to win the youth away from the customs and laws, under whose protection they were to live. The Government was thus paying teachers to crush out the new feelings of patriotism that began to spring up in the hearts of the youthful portion of the Empire. It would have been foolishness to have imagined that the future of the government, founded upon Protestant Principles, and in defiance of the underlying principles of the syllabus, could have been safely committed to men and women educated by Jesuits away from German life and principles. It was this thought, or one like it, that prompted Bismarck to say "We shall not buy peace with Canossa medals; such are not minted in Germany."

In February, 1872, the government sanctioned the school inspection law, which had been passed by the Parliament. This transferred the inspection of the schools from the Church to the State, so that for the sake of the State, school inspectors, hostile to the purposes of the government in this move, could be removed. This act hitherto had been entirely in the hands of the clergy, which means in the hands of the Jesuits. Now laymen are to be given a hand. The Primate of Poland openly refused to obey the law, and commanded the use of the Polish language as before; and supported by Papalism, defied the government. This it was that roused the chancellor and his minister of education to still further efforts. In like manner it stirred the hierarchy to support the powerful Polish churchman. This was not hard to do. During the management of Von Mühler places of highest educational trust had been confided to incompetent Jesuitical sycophants. These could not and would not stand an inspection. Their holdings depended upon the government being beaten in this new departure. The papal hierarchy saw that the school supervision, provided by the government, meant nothing else than the "liberation of the schools from the influence of Jesuitical-ultramontane ecclesiastics."

Here again the government found their best intentions thwarted by the Jesuits. The Pope, no longer able to enlist French and Austrian bayonets to accomplish his designs in Germany, will enlist another army, more obedient and capable of moving with a precision that, unless discovered by the closest political espionage, will accomplish the end while men sleep. The Jesuits are only waiting for such an opportunity. They promise to undo the evil that has been inflicted upon the Roman hierarchy by the school inspection law. They encourage resistance, and give assurances which they never can fulfill. Petitions began pouring in upon the members of the Reichstag, urging upon them drastic measures, by which this influence, detrimental to the best interests of the Empire, might be counteracted. When the Parliament assembled in the spring of 1872, petitions poured in from all sides demanding in the interests of good government the prohibition of the Order of Jesus by the State.

It is when we get hold of the situation that Bismarck will appear in his proper light. A writer in *Donahoe's Magazine* for the present month (January, 1894) speaks of him "as a living picture of brutal force and cruel pride, a giant in size and physical proportions, constantly clad in the warlike uniform of a Prussian officer, full of arrogance and impudence, of duplicity and dishonesty, insulting in speech and despotic in measures, brooking no opposition, and implacable to his adversaries, defying the power of the Holy Church and persecuting her adherents,—he is justly called the man of blood and iron. His tyranny and selfishness earned for him the title of Attila, the scourge of God."* Doubtless he appears all this, when he defied the Vatican and drove the Jesuits out of Germany. Jesuitism found itself confronted with a power such as it had not met before. When Pope Clement XIV., in 1773, abolished the society, it had put itself somewhat in hostility to Rome. But now it had become much stronger, and had made Romanism synonymous with Jesuitism, and felt itself able to defy the

* Page 49.

most gigantic power that could be gathered together on the earth. It has set itself on the high rock of papal infallibility, and made its nest among the professed stars of the Church, and defiantly says, Who shall bring me down to the ground? Scarcely has it attained the giddiest height in its history till a layman says, I will bring thee down to the ground.

The point now is that Bismarck hesitated as long as it was possible before he crushed the arrogant power that clogged the wheels of empire. The German Protestant Assembly reminded the government, and all Germany, that nothing short of the principles of the Syllabus would satisfy the demands of Jesuitism, and this meant a destruction of the authority of the German empire, that the Jesuits were constantly fomenting strife in every part of the Empire, that there is a war to the knife against all the modern ideas for which the German Empire stands. Prince Bismarck was reminded that the Protestant Union "looks upon it as an earnest duty of the German Protestants, and of the whole German nation, to act in regard thereto with energy, that all interference in school and Church matters should be put a stop to as regards those belonging to and affiliated with the Jesuit order."* When the petitions from the Jesuits were put into the hands of the Commission of the Parliament the report almost threw the great chancellor from his accustomed equipoise. He found that he had been criminally negligent in executing the wishes of the Protestant Union. The report ran as follows: "The Order of Jesuits is dangerous to the empire, because it teaches unconditional submission to the hierarchy, and ascribes to the Church rites which are incompatible with the existence of a well-ordered state. The Jesuits are also dangerous to the empire because they have persecuted the new empire with glowing hatred, excited false representations among the Catholic population, sought to diminish the value of the empire, and represented it as the declared enemy of the Church and religion. Lastly, the Jesuits are dangerous also to culture, because they have disturbed the peace of civil society,

* Griesinger, "The Jesuits," Vol. II., 387.

and impeded the moral development of the people. They are, therefore, to be opposed with all, even the most severe measures, and only a law of prohibition, which must be courageously enforced, can be of any avail." * It was when such importunities came from the people and the Parliament, that the government, under the leadership of Bismarck, determined upon the expulsion. Every Roman Catholic pulpit occupied by a Jesuit became a rostrum for political agitation. On the 4th day of July, 1872, the law against the Jesuits was published, which cut deep into the flesh of ultramontanism. In the promulgation of this decree, Bismarck comes after the Parliament and the people, and simply becomes their mouth-piece. Even the promulgation of such drastic measures against the Jesuits did not remove the ulcer from the body politic. The confessional still found itself peopled by crowds, who were under the immediate influence of Jesuitic principles. While for the time being it seemed that the backbone of papal power had not been broken, but simply twisted. The serpentine influences of Jesuitism had simply been scotched, but not crushed. It should always be remembered that the law for the expulsion of the Jesuits was especially aimed at the foreigners, who had been imported into Germany, but who had never caught the new breath of culture and life that was abroad everywhere. German Roman Catholicism was now under the influence of French, Austrian, Spanish and Italian Jesuitism. These were the gentry who were committing all the mischief and inciting the Germans to deeds anything else than patriotic. Roman Catholic writers, without a scintillation of truth, pictured the decree as bearing hard upon soldiers and statesmen whose loyalty had never been questioned, and whose lives were saddened by the wounds and sufferings incurred in establishing the just claims of the empire against all its foes. No truth could be more thoroughly garbled than this.

In May, 1873, there followed the now-celebrated May laws. In these the government sought to make the instructors of the

* Griesinger, "The Jesuits," Vol. II., page 368.

people thoroughly German. Fitness for the exercise of the spiritual offices of the Church required citizenship in the empire, education at German schools, a course in the broadest culture that philosophy, history and literature could furnish. Then if an ecclesiastic was to be judged, he should come under the power of his peers. It was German superiors who were to exercise discipline, in accordance with fixed processional procedure.* It was patent to all that these laws were a necessity, if the attempts to organize an empire were not to prove abortive at the very beginning. Yet it soon became evident that even the May laws were not sufficient to uproot the festering cancer of the body politic. Nothing but the unflinching perseverance of Bismarck could have carried the measure through. "Truly indeed had there been any other man at the head of the imperial government than the magnificent statesman that we possess in Bismarck, and, moreover, had there not been a colossal majority of the German people against the Jesuits, things would have taken a different turn from what actually occurred."† In estimating the part that Bismarck played at this time, we must not forget that he was but the exponent of by far the larger portion of the German people. If he were the monster painted for us by Roman Catholic authorities, without a constituency, the movement would have been but the plaything of those whom he sought to control, if not destroy.

The movement could not remain in *statu quo*. The defiance which was hurled against the government, the attempt upon the chancellor's life, required other measures. The government was compelled to take under its management the whole business of the Church. In this the great chancellor is blamed for being inconsistent. In the earlier stage of the struggle, both the Emperor and Bismarck had eschewed the least intention of interfering with the rights of the different forms of faith in the empire; now, with an uncontrollable will, he seems to interfere along every line, pretending to direct all the different lines

* Kurtz, "Ch. Hist.", Vol. III., 317.

† Griesinger, "The Jesuits," Vol. II., 365.

of effort.. But is there not a cause? Did not the exigencies of the case demand heroic treatment? He had stood outside of these high-walled institutions demanding surrender, and was taunted with a volley of curses that would have awed into silence a man of common back-bone. There was no constitutional authority for such a fierce opposition. It was natural, and inspired by common sense, that Bismarck should say, after every effort had been expended in dislodging them from their hiding-places without effect, " We will step over these walls and see what there is within." This and nothing else could dislodge the enemy. When this was once accomplished, there would be room for conciliatory measures. And scarcely has the first smoke of the Cultukampf battle cleared away before the Iron Duke bends and is ready for any conciliation that is not contrary to the best interests of the empire.

In this contest, when told without any partisan discoloration, the Pope seems to have made a stubborn resistance, that could not be moved by anything short of a restoration of the Jesuits, and the assistance of the German empire to obtain the temporal power which had fallen from his nerveless grasp. In speaking of the Italian Liberals he calls them wolves, perfidious, Pharisées, Philistines, thieves, liars, hypocrites, dropsical, impious, children of Satan, children of perdition, satellites of Satan, monsters of hell, demons incarnate, stinking corpses, teachers of iniquity. The same epithets, and for the same cause, might have been hurled at the German Liberals. And all this billingsgate was expended upon those whose only wrong consisted in asserting that there should be a separation of the Church and State, and that the Syllabus should not be made the foundation stone of the new governments springing up on every hand.

It was a necessity to expel the Jesuits, pass the May laws demanding a rigid inspection of the schools, and deprive some of the most prominent Bishops of their livings. Where these things were being enacted as mere matters of State policy, a pastoral was sent forth instructing the clergy to remain steadfast in their resistance, asserting "that since the days of Dio-

clerical there had not been so violent a persecution of the name of Jesus." The Archbishop of Poland compared the demand to give notification of clerical appointments with the demands of the Roman emperors to cast a pinch of incense to the image of the emperor, or sacrifice to the heathen deities. In the Parliament, the Centre, supported by Poles and Socialists, had fought desperately against all these ecclesiastical laws, and at the same time against every other law which the government sought to carry through. When the power of the Centre in the Parliament could not stay the tide, an anarchistic feeling was aroused and encouraged from Rome, which culminated in an attempt upon the great chancellor's life, at Kissingen, on the 13th of July, 1874. The would-be murderer acknowledged that the deed was prompted by a desire for vengeance upon him who had enforced the May laws and offered such insults to the party of the Centre.

In 1875 another encyclical was sent forth, designating the submission to the laws of the Parliament touching the Church as slavery, and the executors of these laws as godless men. A little later on in the same year there came another letter from the Pope, in which he romanced about a second Nero playing upon a lyre, while with enchanting words he deceived the people and the nations. He spoke much about the man who ruled with a rod of iron. When the German pilgrims went to Rome in 1877, to take part in the Episcopal Jubilee, he had much to tell about the "modern Attila." It is uncertain whether by this endearing (?) term he meant to designate the emperor or the chancellor. The sublime impudence of ultramontane assumptions was reached when the Pope pronounced the May laws invalid, bluntly repudiated all the sovereign rights therein assumed, and authorized and promoted the rebellion of all Catholic subjects against them. That the German army, flushed with the victories of Sadowa, Sedan and Paris, were not led at once against Rome, in order to hush the impious interference with good government, shows a patience and forbearance which might have been expected in the old emperor, but not in the

chancellor, who then shared with the emperor the enthusiasm of the German people.

In 1878 Leo XIII. was elected Pope. Be it said to the honor of the newly chosen Pope, that he was ready to confer with the German authorities, in the hope of some understanding by which the irrepressible conflict might be modified at least. If it would have been possible for the Curia to have freed itself from the bands of Jesuitism, which the former Pope had permitted to grow around it, there would have been some hope of success. The numerous attempts proved in the end failures. The demands of the Curia were of such a nature that the State could not submit to them without stultifying itself at every turn, and declaring the struggles both in the Parliament and in the army as worse than foolhardy and entirely nugatory. The conciliatory measures have been carried forward at different times. In all these efforts it looks as if the successors of Bismarck had gone far on the way to Canossa, and one side of the medals, at least, by which peace had been secured, had been engraved from a die with Canossa inscriptions. Ultramontanism must rule or ruin. It cannot treat with any government without being allowed to have its own way. To refuse this is to incur a displeasure which never ceases to take vengeance, however, for this may require opposition to that which is for good government.

After the German Empire had once become thoroughly established, and in quick succession had lost the old Emperor, and then "Unser Fritz," and found the reins of empire in the hands of a young and comparatively inexperienced man, without any serious consequences it felt as if it could be gracious to the advances that were made by the papal authority. Its generous treatment has only warmed into life the viper that for the while seemed frozen to death. The Jesuits have been permitted to return to Germany; the power of the Centre, in league with Social Democrats, still blusters and fumes against the proper execution of the laws. Quietly, but none the less effectively, a spirit of discord and opposition to all the laws

of the new empire is being fomented everywhere. The growth of social democracy is encouraged, in the hope that the new ideas of the State and Church will prove a bond instead of a blessing. The head of the camel is already in the tent, and with some encouragement will soon be followed by the whole body. That this is the programme now being formulated at Rome, has never escaped the clear vision of the great chancellor, even though he may be in retirement. The great antithesis between ultramontanism and the modern state threatens to become a fire-brand, scattering a deadly strife on every hand. The return of the Jesuits will either make Germany Romanistic, or a State under the control of the Social Democrats, or the government will be aroused to array itself against both these forms of anti-liberalism. The first is not at all likely to happen, the second is a bare possibility, and the last is more than probable. This will be accomplished peaceably by the increasing ideas and forces, which had scarcely begun to be, when the first contest was waged. It will be accomplished by a war of ideas or aims more furious than that of two decades ago, if the Jesuits should get hold enough to interfere with the successful operations of government. At present it would seem as if Germany could afford to be gracious to even her most bitter enemies; but the lawlessness of the Jesuits may demand a corresponding harshness on the part of the regularly constituted authorities, if Protestantism is to be protected, and the State preserved. The recent reconciliation of the young Emperor and the great Chancellor impressed the idea upon the world that the new government was awaking to the threatening invasion of the same old foe. The triumphant entrance of Bismarck into Berlin evidenced at the same time that German patriotism flames as high as when the victories of Sadowa, Sedan and Paris flushed the soldiery, and that any movement looking to the suppression of tendencies that interfered with the triumphal march of New Germany would be heartily seconded by all the blood and brawn of the people.

VII.

GENERAL CONCLUSIONS FROM STUDY OF ST. PAUL'S EPISTLES.

(Translated from Godel's *Introduction au Nouveau Testament*, Vol. I., *Les Epîtres de Saint Paul.*)

BY REV. HENRY S. GEKELER.

I. The thirteen Epistles of St. Paul, which have been preserved to us, are divided into four groups, distinguished by dates and by the matter treated.

The *First* (from the year 53), which includes the two Epistles to the Thessalonians, deals with the subject which interested the Church most at its origin, the return of Christ.

The *Second* (54–59), which includes the Epistles to the Galatians (54–55), the two to the Corinthians (57–58) and that to the Romans (58–59), deals essentially with Christian salvation and the mode of its appropriation.

The *Third* (62–64), in which we class the Epistles to the Colossians, to Philemon and to the Ephesians (62–68), and to the Philippians (63–64), has for its principal object the person of the Saviour and His union with the Church, which He constitutes His organ here below.

The *Fourth* (64–66), which includes the three Pastorals, has for its end to assure the future of the Church on the earth, under those who are to instruct it and govern it after the departure of the apostles.

This gradation has nothing systematic about it; it was the result of the natural course of things. The promised great future preoccupied at first the thought of the early Christians, and raised the questions related to it. Then the attention of

the Church was necessarily drawn to the nature of the salvation to which we owe that great hope, and to the means of its acquisition. Thence it was spontaneously raised to the contemplation of the person of Him to whom we owe that salvation, and who by His constant union with the Church enables her to inherit the promised glory. Finally as those disappeared who had founded the Church by revealing to her that salvation, Christian thought had to transfer itself to the conservation of the earthly society which had been constituted the depository of it. Thus the succession of the four groups which we have established is explained in a very simple manner.

With this general gradation agrees in a remarkable way the particular gradation which we observe upon certain points.

And first as to the relation between Judaism and the Church. In the first group the relation is that of pure hostility; still alien to the Church, Judaism is simply a persecutor (1 Thess.). In the second group the relation becomes complicated. Judaism tries to enter the Church and get possession of it by imposing upon it the yoke of Mosaism. Forced to retreat under that gross form by the powerful resistance of Paul, we see it return to the charge in the third group more refined and more seductive, offering the law to believers as a means of entering into a more intimate communion with the celestial spirits and of securing them as mediators along side of and perhaps above Christ. In the fourth group, after this new effort had failed, Judaism presents nothing more than a caricature of itself, selling like a peddler, to the curiosity of the faithful, profane frivolities which have no connection with piety and practical faith.

Another gradation, not less remarkable, offers itself in the appearance of spiritual gifts and in their connection with the function of teaching. In the first group we notice the appearance of gifts in the Gentile church under a form most modest. It is prophecy that is not to be despised, and speaking in the Spirit that is not to be quenched (1 Thess. v. 19-21). With this we see also appear a beginning of orders (v. 12-13, "those who have the rule over you"). We admire in the second group the

full blossom of spiritual powers. At Corinth they fill with their brilliant manifestations the whole stage of the life of the Church. The orders—for there are such, and it is wrong to stubbornly refuse to recognize their existence—are relegated to the background; they seem to be as yet only simple offices necessary to the exterior life of the Church and to the assistance of the poor.

This relation commences to be transformed in the third group. Not only among the gifts does the word of the teachers appear to take precedence over that of the prophets and of the speakers in tongues; there is no longer even a question of the latter; but the teachers are almost identified with the pastors (pastors and teachers, Eph. iv. 11), who are no other than the presbyters (Acts xx. 28). In the Epistle to the Philippians there is no longer the least allusion to charismatical gifts; it is upon the two orders of the episcopate and of the diaconate that the real progress of the Church reposes.

A step toward a more complete union of the function of teaching with the order of bishop is seen, lastly, in the *Pastorals*, although the fusion is still far from being consummated.

The capacity of teaching is required of him who aspires to the episcopate, and the bishop who, while being a faithful ruler, has applied himself to instruction and to edification, is doubly worthy of recognition by the Church. Now Timothy is to have a care to develop, even aside from the episcopate, men capable of teaching the faithful. We are then still far from the future episcopate; but we are walking on the road which conducts to it.

Relatively to the expectation of Christ's return, finally, the two impressions of the apostle the most different, are expressed in the two letters which occupy the first and last place. In 1 Thess., Paul, altogether uncertain of the moment of his death (v. 10, "Whether we wake or whether we sleep"), classes himself, inasmuch as he is actually living, among those who shall be present at that return (iv. 17), while in 2 Tim. he expects nothing more than a near death and his entrance into the

heavenly kingdom (iv. 18), and he speaks of the Parousia only in connection with those coming after him. Ranging between these two extreme points are the other epistles: 1 Cor. (xv. 52) which attaches itself immediately to 1 Thess.; and the Epistle to the Philippians which (i. 20-21) forms the transition to 2 Tim.; between these two are 2 Cor. and Rom., in which the two contrary impressions are in some sort balanced (2 Cor. v. 2-4, 6-9 and Rom. xiv. 8).

These diverse series which agree among themselves and which tally perfectly with the chronological order which our study has assigned to the Epistles of Paul, are at the same time the counter-proof of that general result. We might also be convinced by this, that in order to admit a movement constant and progressive in the thought of the apostle, it is not necessary to think of him as creating spontaneously by his own speculation his conception of Christian salvation and adding year by year a new story to the edifice. The great fact of salvation conceived and accomplished by God, and which by the revelation Paul had received of it and by the experience he had made of it, reflected itself distinctly in his thought, remained at bottom permanent, the indissoluble bond of those various teachings which are contained in the four groups of his letters. Although anathematizing himself, as he declared in Galatians in case he should ever alter that salvation divinely received (Gal. i.), he compels himself on every occasion to adapt the preaching of it to the different needs of those whom he addressed. He sought, as he said to those very Galatians, *to change his voice* (*ἀλλάζει τὴν ρόνην*, iv. 20) to discern in each case the side of the truth appropriate to answer to the needs of his hearers or readers, and the forms of language and exposition most appropriate to make it penetrate their hearts. According as the spiritual state of the community of believers was transformed by the internal action of the Christian life and under better environments, he drew from that salvation new resources and new accents which were adapted to the given situations.

It is thus that we find him in turn Prophet, drawing the

double picture, dark and luminous, of the end of things, in the Epistles to the Thessalonians; the sharp Polemic, repelling the intermeddling of Judaism, in the Epistles to the Galatians and to the Colossians; the luminous Doctor, calmly expounding Christian salvation and its progress into the heart of humanity, in the Epistle to the Romans; the Psalmist, celebrating in exalted terms the magnificent work of the incorporation of the heathen into the kingdom of God, in the Epistle to the Ephesians; the Pastor, gathering with his shepherd's crook, in wisdom, firmness, severity, and especially in love, the flock just ready to escape from him, in the two Epistles to the Corinthians; the Father of the family, thanking and encouraging children well beloved, in Philippians; the devoted Friend, interceding seriously and playfully with one brother for another brother who has offended him, in Philemon; the Administrator, with spirit practical and far-seeing, taking care of his work which he was going to leave, in the Pastoral Epistles. No string is lacking to his instrument; he makes them vibrate, each one at the desired moment, conformably with the subject which he is treating; one only foundation; always different aspects of the same fundamental truth, due also sometimes to new revelations on certain particular points.

II. We have just considered Paul in comparison with *himself*; let us now compare him to the *other apostles*. Between him and them we note a fundamental difference. During the two years and a half which the Twelve passed with Jesus, they did not cease looking upon the Mosaic religion as the base upon which ought forever to rest the work of their Master; in Jesus Himself they saw only the supreme realization of Judaism. High as He raised them by His teaching and by His personal contact, it was still Judaism that was increasing with Him and with them; the idea of a possible rupture with that religious constitution divinely granted never entered their mind. And if the promises of Jesus made them catch a glimpse of the entrance of the Gentiles into the Divine kingdom, it seemed to them that that great fact could not be accomplished for the

heathen except as they should be cast into the mould of Mo-siasm and they should come forth Jews. Even after Pentecost, it was only gradually that their piety was disengaged from the received forms in order to create new ones, and that the teaching of the Spirit conducted them to the spiritualism and universalism of which Jesus had planted in them the germ. It required the vision at Joppa and the experience with Cornelius to extort from Peter that exclamation of surprise, "In truth I perceive"—ἐπ' ἀληθέας καταλαμβάνομαι (Acts 10: 34). Without the express divine mission which Philip had received, he would probably not have dared to grant baptism to the Ethiopian eunuch, who asked it only by virtue of his faith. Jesus had not suddenly withdrawn his disciples from the particularism of the theocracy. That enfranchisement was one of the things to which applied the words He spoke to them before His death: "I have still many things to tell you." And certainly the influence of Paul and of the immense work accomplished by him in the heathen world did not count for little in the growing emancipation of the apostles.

Altogether different was the course of Paul. His enfranchisement from Judaism was instantaneous and radical. He himself compared that rupture to the operation by which a child is violently taken from its mother's womb (1 Cor. xv. 8). The illumination which accompanied that moment was sudden as the rupture; the apostle compares it to the effect produced by that divine command: "Let there be light," which dissipated the night of chaos (2 Cor. iv. 6). It was that decisive moment that Paul described in his address to Peter on the occasion of the conflict at Antioch, when he said to him (Gal. ii. 19), "As for me I by the law am dead to the law, in order that I might live to God; I am crucified with Christ." In other words, by the condemnation into which it brings me and by the inability of keeping it in which I see myself, the law has forced me to break with it and to seek my righteousness in the Cross alone; there in communion with the Crucified One, I am at last dead to myself in order to live to God. It was thus when he had pushed

to its very limit his fidelity to the law, that in a flash the yoke of the law was broken for him. There was not with Paul any slow transition, any middle ground; the appearance of Christ had swept away all his past, his soul was clear; his aspiration was intense; the gift of God answered to it; he was complete and completely possessed. If ever the word of Jesus, "There are last that shall be first," was verified in history, it was in this example forever a prototype, as Paul himself well understood it (1 Tim. i. 16).*

III. He was then for a moment in advance of the Twelve. But did he not, as some have claimed, go beyond Christ himself? Did he not become a creator instead of remaining a simple disciple? Did he not find a Christianity different from that of which Jesus thought? according to some, more spiritual and broader; according to others, more intellectual and more dogmatic? Did he not bring into the new religion a foreign alloy, rabbinical formulas, Alexandrian speculations, Greek philosophizing? Assuredly, if the conversion of Paul had been a revolution of an intellectual nature, the solution of a speculative crisis, one might ask such questions. But the thing at issue for him is concerning a religious and moral enigma. Christ presented Himself to him, not to give a response to questions, a solution of doubts, but to give to his soul panting for salvation, pardon and a new life. He revealed Himself to him, not as a Gamaliel of superior order, but as his Saviour and his Lord. And the bond which ever after attached Paul to this Master, was not only that of a respectful affection, but that of absolute dependence and adoration. Such a relation does not comport itself with the suppositions we have just enunciated. No more do the facts confirm them. Paulinism gushed forth into the world with too lively a sweep, too original, too powerful, too coherent, not to be the work of one stream. If at times he

* Does any one raise as an objection the vow of Cenchrea (Acts xviii. 18), that at Jerusalem (Acts xxi. 26)? But Paul has himself explained it (1 Cor. ix. 20-22), and we see in what followed how he proceeded according to the word and spirit of Jesus.

may appear rabbinical in form, at bottom he is always new. He may in his development even agree with certain notions or expressions of the Talmud or from Philo; but let us not forget that between him and these systems there was the common ground of the Old Testament. As to the Hellenism that is claimed in the Pauline teaching, there is an error in date. We must come down to Justin, Clement and Origen in order to find the intrusion of Greek metaphysics into the gospel teaching.

The Christian conception of the apostle is not a composite of gathered fragments; it is a whole whose diverse parts are closely bound together; it is a unique unfolding on all sides of the salvation accomplished and interpreted by Christ. Everything starts from that point of departure as the living organism from the cell in which it was contained.

The apostle, it is true, does not often cite the text of the words of Jesus; but how shall we help recognizing the close relation which exists between the teaching of the one and that of the other: between the manner with which Paul presents justification by faith, and the words as well as the practice of Jesus Himself; between the exposition by Paul of expiation, and the institution of the Holy Supper; between the communion of the glorified Christ and the Church as Paul depicts it under the figure of the head and body, and the promises of Christ relative to His return in the Spirit; between the expectation of the coming of the Lord, in which the apostle lived, and the discourses of Jesus upon that subject; between the declarations of Paul on the abolition of the law, and the words of Jesus which implied the abrogation of the Levitical prescriptions of food (Matt. xv. 16-20), and the cessation of the worship of the temple (Matt. xxiv. 2); between the universalism of salvation according to Paul, and the command of Jesus to preach the Gospel to every human creature, without there being any mention made of the law? I do not know of any part of the teaching or work of Paul, of which we do not find the principle already laid down in the life and in the words of the Lord.

Jesus has, if I may so speak, drawn the apex of the angle, of which Paul has only extended the sides.

There is especially one teaching of Jesus, in which we may catch the perfect conformity of thought between Him and the Apostle Paul. It is that which contains the parable of the old garment and the new garment, and that of old bottles and new wine, with the following word in which Jesus brings out the difficulty there is for those who are accustomed to old wine, to accustom themselves to the freshness of new wine (Luke v : 30). The old garment which cannot be patched, but for which a new one must be substituted, clearly represents the old Mosaic regime which may not be completed by new rites, such as fasting, but which must disappear altogether to give place to the regime of the Spirit. The old bottles, unable to preserve the new wine, represent not less clearly pharisaical Israel too infatuated with legal observances to receive and preserve the new wine of the Gospel, which reclaims new souls to retain it. The word by which Jesus closes is a word of excuse in favor of sincere Jews, whose old prejudgetments prevent them as yet from breaking away from legal observances and who must not be startled in their spiritual course, which is a little slow and methodical. What is the work of St. Paul if not the faithful execution of that programme? And this he did step by step, from that clear opposition which he established between what he called the *oldness of the letter and the newness of the spirit* (Rom. vii : 6), to the great call of the Gentiles and to the formation of a new Israel, and, finally, to that conduct full of consideration toward the tardy but sincere Jews, whom he treated all his life with such great tenderness.

Will some one object that it is the evangelist Luke who, as a true follower of Paul, puts in advance into the mouth of the Master what is necessary to justify the work of the apostle? But the two parables which we have just mentioned are found also with Matthew and with Mark. They are thus part of the apostolic tradition, and they have thus the strongest guaranty which any word of Jesus could possess. Besides, their incom-

parable originality sufficiently protects them against any such suspicion. Holtzmann says: "They belong to the most authentic of the authentic." As to the following declaration which we do not find in Luke, it is connected too immediately and too delicately with the second parable not to be as authentic as that is.

We conclude: St. Paul did nothing but execute what Jesus had hinted at and wisely prepared for, without himself being able to realize it; for what reason? We learn it from his lips: the time was not yet come. In St. Paul was accomplished in highest degree the promise of Jesus: "The works that I do shall ye do also, yea, and greater works than these shall ye do, for I go unto my Father."

Paul assigns himself the last place; but he was none the less the greatest, next to Him who can be compared to none other.

VIII.

THE SPIRIT OF HIGHER CRITICISM.*

BY PROF. JACOB COOPER, S. T. D., D. C. L., RUTGERS COLLEGE.

THERE are those who are out of sympathy with the doctrines of the Church and yet appear to be unaware of this fact. For they show uncommon desire to remain in the fold and enjoy all the protection the erroneous body can give them. This may be the result of unconscious mental cerebration. Still we would expect that when a radical change of view supersedes the faith once avowed and made the indispensable basis of admission to the privileges of the Church and ministry, the man who experiences such a change should himself become aware of it first. Moreover, when he abandons this faith he will, if honest, at once depart from the communion and surrender his trusts without waiting to be invited out. Yet, when condemned by a majority of three to one in the Church court of last resort, this decision is interpreted to mean that the great body of the Church is still devoted to his teachings. This self-deception, whether voluntary or involuntary, is a practical illustration of the Higher Criticism. For it can make the Word of God teach anything the critical sense desires, even to falsify directly its plainest utterances. The same skill is shown in the interpretation of duty to the Church. While a monopoly of candor and fairness is claimed by the critic, he charges dishonesty on all who still maintain the accepted doctrines which he once

* We publish this paper not because it expresses our views concerning the "Higher Criticism," but because on such a subject we believe the cause of truth is best subserved by giving a hearing to all parties.—*Editors of Reformed Quarterly Review.*

promised to defend. If they oppose his views they are ignorant bigots; if they call him to account for abuse of trust, they are malignant persecutors. It must be plain to any fair-minded man that these Higher Critics labor to defend a theory, not to discover the truth, and seek notoriety, not the peace of the Church. While they may not be of enough consequence personally to create a ripple in this peace had they remained outside where they belong, yet having obtained a foothold within they can make the enemy to rejoice by traitorous utterances. The difficulty of dealing with them increases their impudence. The process by which a false member may be cast out is both ungrateful to the prosecutor and most disturbing to the Church. Hence the proverbial audacity of those who know themselves to be false to the creed they profess. They look upon a subscription to the formularies of a church much as a gay French or Spanish lady does on marriage. She finds a lawful protector who secures her respectable standing in society. The bills are paid, her support is guaranteed, her peccadillos are covered up; and she is enabled to lead a disorderly life with impunity. The infidelities in either case are hard to discover, and when proven bring the innocent party into disagreeable notoriety. And the cause of all this disgrace, after destroying the peace of a house, insists on being rewarded with alimony!

This picture is not overdrawn. Bishop Colenso, for example, departed from the faith which his ordination vows bound him to maintain in the face of all opposition. He did not even pretend after a time to be in sympathy with that body of Christians whose creed he despised, whose sacred Book he ridiculed, whose defenders he maligned. Yet he clung with dogged tenacity to the honors and emoluments of his office. He, as an uncompromising enemy, still claimed all the rights with which he had been invested as a defender. Similar conduct, *magna camponere parvis*, may be seen nearer home. The Congregational and Presbyterian Churches have been disquieted recently, and are threatened with a continuation, by persons who never could get the coveted notoriety until they attacked

their own house, and, according to the measure of their ability, tried to pull it down over their heads. And though they berate its doctrines and endeavor to raze its foundation walls, still they manifest strange reluctance to be removed beyond the line which marks its boundaries. They "stand on the order of their going," and at this juncture as heretics they become famous. For as the world measures their greatness by the noise they make, it is for a time carried away with admiration.

Each age of the Church has its peril which must be met as it arises. The special phase of heresy most ripe at present is a simulated zeal for the integrity of the Divine Word with a harpy-like ferocity in tearing it to pieces. Under the name of Higher Criticism which places itself above Revelation, and so subordinates the utterances of the Holy Spirit to human reason, the troublers of Israel weaken the respect for the authority on which our faith rests, and of course free themselves from obedience to a creed which they destroy by showing that it rests on no Divine warrant. For by a dissecting process they undertake to show which part is spurious; and each scholar pursuing his own method, the destructive process goes on until discredit is cast upon the whole written Word. For who is to decide which elimination is right? The self-confidence of each critic is equal to that of his fellow. Hence doubt is cast upon every part in turn. For the critic is sure of nothing, save that his judgment, in rejecting the portion which his keen sense condemns, is infallible. He knows that the Holy Spirit could not utter such a sentiment because this does not agree with the moral sense of mankind; which is only a modest way of asserting that this moral sense is in his special keeping. Such a book or sentence is declared to be not genuine because it does not agree with the grammatical style or sentiment of the writer. Of course the critic knows just what the language and thought of the writer must be, since it is so easy to gauge the capacity of one who is divinely inspired. Plato says, "It is not hard to doubt." In truth the meanest capacity is sufficient to discover blemishes, and having a natural affinity with deformity

can find it anywhere. And it is easy to say what revelation should be if this depends on the whim of the critic. Yet if this summary process be allowed we will have a Bible diverse as the tastes of the several scholars who reconstruct it from inner consciousness, and all will be destroyed piecemeal. But with naive generosity these critics grant us the satisfaction of knowing that *the whole Bible taken together contains the Will of God infallibly sure, though each part is proved untrustworthy.* For a sufficient number of errors will neutralize each other, and the residuum becomes inerrant truth! The absurdity of this theory needs only to be stated nakedly to be rejected. Each book and verse of revelation may contain errors. Each critic is to be the judge of what and where they are. All are right in their own estimation, and being so the result is that every portion of the Bible in turn is stripped of Divine authority. What remains is a *caput mortuum*, which has no more respect than the critics can invest it with. The world asks what such a Bible as this is worth? The Church wishes to know where is the ultimate ground of her faith. If the foundations be destroyed what can the righteous do? is her plaintive cry. For we must have authority somewhere; a common criterion by which to test our judgment and guide our lives. Otherwise we usurp the place of God, and become not only a law unto ourselves, but unto Him.

The application of Philology to the interpretation of the Scriptures has most important uses which are freely admitted. But this science must be kept in its proper place. This is to tell us what the Revealed Word actually says, not what fallible men—however learned—think it ought to say. There must be an admission, *ab initio*, that a Revelation from God is above human reason, or else there can be none at all, and no need of any. The critic admits in general that: “This is granted. But my judgment must determine what Revelation should teach, else I cannot accept it; for nothing can be accepted which my reason cannot comprehend and my judgment approve.” Yet this at once supersedes the neces-

sity. For if the critic can tell what the message from God should be, he is not only wise above that which is written, but above the Author who should be the judge of what is necessary. Here we have the controversy of revelation versus reason; a contention as old as the Church, and likely to continue until all men shall be humble enough to subordinate their own pride of intellect to the Divine authority.

It matters not that these critics do not agree with each other, and that their methods and results are mutually subversive. The process goes on though each critic is proved to be wrong, and all his erudition found to be chaff driven by the wind. We have seen the same course of destructive criticism pursued with many ancient authors whose writings claim no more than human authorship. The songs of Homer and the history of Herodotus have been subjected to a slashing process which left nothing but the *disjecta membra* of the dissecting room, noisome and waiting burial. At the beginning of this century F. A. Wolf dismembered Homer with the cleaver of a butcher. He eliminated part after part until there was nothing left of the Iliad or Odyssey but fugitive songs, such as were sung by vagabond minstrels. There was no connected story, nothing but mythical tales strung together at random by Pisistratus or the Alexandrine grammarians. Homer himself became a myth, and Troy never had an existence. Herodotus fared little better. He was a garrulous story-teller, who relied on the gullibility of his hearers while he drew on his imagination for the facts. He was everywhere derided as a historian, and relegated to the company of Gulliver and Munchausen. But, after a time, Schliemann and Layard began to dig. They found remains which corresponded with the descriptions of the Iliad and the garrulous traveler so closely that they read the originals in a new light. One fact and correspondence suggested another. By and by cuneiform inscriptions were deciphered. Libraries of baked bricks were found and read. Herodotus now is veritable history; the Iliad a descriptive poem with unity of design suggesting one author, and Agamemnon king.

among men. Wolf's *Prolegomena* is now only a curious specimen of perverted ingenuity, as deliciously absurd in its conclusions as the speculations of Doctor Akakia. Not only have succeeding critics and explorers shown that the learned tomes of *cock-sure* criticism on the leading classic authors were like blind men shooting at a mark ; but even the same critic has written on both sides of the same question so as to be certain that he was right. For Professor Nitzsch, of Kiel, wrote a ponderous volume of 700 pages to prove that the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* were composed by different authors ; and after waiting twenty years, when everybody, including himself, had forgotten his whole work, he wrote another as extensive to prove diametrically the reverse of his former position !

There is a confidence begotten of ignorance which nothing can shake. As it rests simply on the *critical sense* it can change its base in a moment. For this sense, which is superior to evidence and therefore needs none but its own infallibility, yields readily to a new mood ; and then a fresh theory of interpretation is quietly adopted without anybody being the wiser. One would think that the fate of Kuinoel, Lachmann, Paulus and Ewald, whose theories are superseded as rapidly as the changing fashions at Paris, would enable the small fry of servile American imitators to see the absurdity of their claim to infallibility, though we never expect them to become conscious how feeble are their own echoes of the Higher Criticism. Horace tells us that there is a species of insanity so inveterate that all the hellebore grown on three Anticyrae will not heal it !

We need something more stable than the results of Higher Criticism. The acceptance of an infallible authority is necessary to the existence of a Church. The Romanist finds this in the pretended successor of Peter, and in the decrees of General Councils ; the Protestant, in an inerrant Bible illuminated by the Holy Spirit. But if men have no confidence in the credibility of their guide-book they will not follow its directions. If doubt be cast on it to any degree, just to that degree will it fail to meet the wants of those who feel their ignorance and there-

fore their dependence. For those who are conscious of neither it makes no difference. Satisfied with themselves, they can make their own creed, each for himself; can make it to suit their varying moods; and, as it really means nothing, it matters not what they make it. This is the effect on all those whom the mania, Higher Criticism, attacks. They have unsettled themselves, and to the extent they have influence they unsettle others. But the Church is not upheld by these. The great preachers of all ages and sections of Christendom have been noted for their steadfast advocacy of an inerrant Bible. God speaks to man, and the word which he utters vouches for its own authenticity by the effect which it has on the character of the individual and the activity of the Church in all holy living. The confidence of the believer is not in himself, but in a Power above his own, and a wisdom which is profitable to direct. The record of this Power he touches with reverent hands. He believes it to be the counterpart of Nature. For just as in the material works of the Creator he expects to find truth by inquiring what they really are, not by making them over again to suit his own fancy; even so when God speaks in His revelation of His moral law. The naturalist does not doubt the truthfulness of the material record, but his own power of comprehension. He sees the finger of God at work, and endeavors to trace the characters and read their meaning. But he does not try to make the record anew. There is no doubt except as to his power to arrive at what God purposes to say in Nature. The higher criticism of Hypotheses has been wrecked so often that the true scientist prefers to let the record speak for itself. Analogy would suggest a similar treatment for that which not only claims to be a Divine record, but attests that claim by the effect which it has exerted on human nature. Here, however, destructive criticism, while at first not bold enough to avow its distrust of the whole record, perhaps not even conscious of such a desire, yet by the unholy tampering with that which God has left for an infallible guide, is led on to seek flaws rather than accept manifest perfections until the Word becomes despicable in

his own eyes. Instead of a living organism, instinct with intelligence and beauty, it is a mass of flesh and bones; dismembered, hacked to pieces and noisome to his critical sense. Confidence is lost in that which we treat with disrespect. And if those whose duty it is to lead others to God have no faith in the only guide we have, the probability or even possibility of a revealed religion is questioned. Such has always been the effect of the higher criticism. It has weakened the sanctions of the divine law just in proportion as the claim for the Bible to be an inerrant guide has been questioned. No sinner is awakened by an appeal to a law which has no sanctions, or quickened to holy living by a Gospel which is pronounced mythical. The progress of Christianity is effected by men positively assured of the fact that God has sent them armed with a commission which is specific in its orders and undoubted in its authority. Those who have confidence in the cause they advocate will awaken enthusiasm, the precursor of success. McClellan, while trembling for his own safety, did not believe that he could ever get into Richmond; Grant believed *he could*, and got there.

On the basis of an inerrant revelation a creed is formulated which demands more than a Jesuitical acceptance from those who teach it to others, and who themselves hold the position they do, and receive its emoluments, by virtue of a solemn vow to teach that form of doctrine in the common acceptance of its terms. The Church does not make progress by fighting with herself, but by conflict with the powers of evil without. She has never become lukewarm by living up to the strictest claims of inspiration. She never loses her power for progress by holding fast to the form of sound words, and contending earnestly for the faith once delivered to the saints.

FIDELITY DEMANDED.

It must be plain to every candid mind that the Church is too lax in dealing with those errorists which are within her bosom. The experience of all ages shows that heretics will not withdraw voluntarily, and that her most dangerous foes are those who

fight from within. Surgery is painful; but the member when once mortified must be removed. The dead flesh will not slough off if let alone, but will extend until it involves the whole. There is too much license allowed to the disturbers of the peace who fight under the banner of a nominal Christianity. They arrogate to themselves all its charity; and assume that, because they will freely consort with the enemies of the faith and bid God-speed to those who teach false doctrines, therefore they have the monopoly of all virtues. They are the progressive, the wide-awake, the learned, who contend against a worn-out creed maintained by orthodox stupidity. This claim is made so persistently that it wins a *quasi* acceptance by its audacity; and the Church shrinks from disputing the assumption while half apologetically defending her own precious faith. All seem to forget that it is not the loose in doctrine who carry the Church in safety through troublous times; and if it were not for those who are sound in the faith she would always be in the wilderness. Nay, more. Were it not for those who abide faithful, the heretic could have no Church to distress and grow fat by despoiling.

It was said long ago of traitors in the State: "Whence any one might see most clearly that he who especially guards his own country, and most vigorously opposes you, traitors and hirelings, he it is who procures for you the means whereby you may receive bribes; and through the multitudes of those who resist your plots, you yourselves are secure and get your price; since if it depended on you alone you would have perished long ago" (Demosthenes, *De Cor.*, 242). In our own day we have seen that traitors can live and flourish by the rewards of their treachery only because other men more patriotic than themselves maintained the State; for if all had been equally traitorous they would have perished together with their ruined country. Even so in the Church. If it were not for the faithful believers who hold fast the form of sound words, who know from personal experience the value of true doctrine, who possess something positive for a rallying cry in advancing against indifference

or open hostility, no Church could be maintained in the world.

There is something exceedingly perverse in human nature, as shown in the treatment of those who violate law. The offender becomes the object of as much admiration as though he were the benefactor of the race. Let any miscreant commit a shameful or revolting crime. At first there is a thrill of horror, which lasts till the law lays its hands on the offender to drag him to deserved punishment, when, presto! the criminal is invested with a sort of inviolability. The very magnitude and enormity of the crime elevate the perpetrator to heroism. The great wrong to society is forgotten, while the cruelty of the law is berated. The sanctity of the criminal's life is descended upon, while the lives taken and the families bereaved are forgotten. It is quite lost sight of that he is an outlaw by his own action, and that if such as he were multiplied they would destroy society and reduce man to a level with the brutes. The opposition to properly constituted authority appears to possess a witchery for the multitude, and at once enlists all the disorderly elements. For a consciousness that the law is their enemy and that they deserve its rigor arouses them to oppose its execution in the case of others; and hence they complain of its injustice through a secret fear of personal application.

A like influence sways all those who are loose in doctrine, causing them to co-operate with the baser sort in condemning beforehand all punitive action by ecclesiastical courts. Leaving out of view the fact that the Church is long-suffering, that every devoted Christian loves peace and shrinks from extreme measures toward brethren, the enemies of truth raise a hue and cry against any man who feels constrained, in order to protect the good name of religion, to prosecute bold errorists. Men who have no settled convictions themselves, and for that reason do not believe that anybody else has, think it personal hatred or dark bigotry which influences the prosecutor. Such is the clamor raised against that man who feels his convictions worth battling for that few are willing to face the odium of bringing

charges of false doctrine, even when it is felt that the peace of the Church is jeopardized. Added to this are the law's delay and uncertainty, especially in ecclesiastical courts; and the assurance of widespread disquiet while the trial is in progress.

But if the reluctance to prosecute be overcome, and the errorist brought to bay, instead of admitting what is evident to all, but especially to himself, that he is out of sympathy with the belief of the Church, and that he is destroying her peace, he employs all the tricks which render even political methods odious to retard the investigation of his views, and thus defeat the ends of justice. He seems oblivious of the fact that it is his duty to relieve his brethren of all trouble caused by investigating his doctrines, and that he is to blame for all the confusion which attends the infliction of Church censures. The number of those who entertain similar views with himself cannot be considered an element in the determination of his duty. The question, stripped of all disguises, is whether his views accord with the accepted creed of the body which he professes to instruct. He may have made many converts to his errors, but he cannot in justice avail himself of his own wrong to defeat the ends of justice. Others may be quite as false as he to the creed of his Church; the heresy may be widespread through his own covert action; but the multiplication of wrongs will never make them right. "To the law and to the testimony: if they speak not according to this word, it is because there is no light in them."

Thus he forces upon his brethren the ungrateful task of prosecuting one whom they probably love as a friend, albeit they hold the truth dearer than all friendship.* And when at last he departs, it is with the groans of a martyr who bears a cross laden with all the spoils he can wrest from a torn and bleeding Church. Moreover, while he is careful to take all he can with him, he is also like the harpies in defiling what he cannot devour or take away. He points to the success of his work attested by

* Aristotle, Ethic. Nicom., Cap. VI. 1: ἀμφοῖν γαρ δυτον φίλουν ὅπειν πρότιμάν τηγαν ἀληθείαν.

the multitudes which are gathered to hear him; while the chief reasons that move them are that he wages a free fight with the true faith which they hate; that he ridicules as bigots those who condemn their vices; while he makes the gate to heaven so wide, and the way so broad, that those who have neither faith nor works can enter. Thus the false teacher can always attract greater numbers than the true one because Satan has the overwhelming majority of followers in this world. Besides, crowds will follow any man possessed of notoriety, no matter from what cause it may arise. The greatest throng that can be collected is to witness the trial and execution of a desperate criminal. A dancing bear attracts more notice than one moving on all fours; Tom Thumb, more interest than Apollo Belvidere; Barnum's woolly horse, than Sheridan's charger. For where the carcase is there the young eagles will be gathered together. Sound doctrine goes a begging because it is disagreeable to the wicked heart, while the mock reformer prides himself on the large following which for a time soothes his exile. Meantime the Satanic Press takes a deep interest in the affairs of the Church, and makes itself the especial patron of a religion so free that it is bound by no creed, and of a charity so extensive that it embraces all except those who believe in scriptural truth. Orthodoxy is dressed in the skins of wild beasts, and all the curs of low degree are hounded on to bark at it. Still the Church moves calmly on, being quickened continually by the Holy Spirit who honors the fearless proclamation of the inspired Word. For the preaching of the Cross in the simple words of inerrant Revelation is, in every age, the power of God and the wisdom of God unto salvation. Whether it be Augustine or Anselm, Luther or Calvin, Whitfield or Edwards, Spurgeon or Moody, their ability to renew the life of the Church is measured by their fearless advocacy of the whole Word of God. Such doctrine abides in its power to save; it is the hope of the Church and the world; and is able to endure all opposition, even the covert assaults of false brethren.

IX.

REASONS FOR BELIEVING IMMERSION NOT ESSENTIAL TO BAPTISM.

BY REV. CHARLES C. STARBUCK, D.D.

ONE of the great arguments for Immersion, apart from the use of the word *βαπτίζω*, is drawn from the two allusions of Paul to burial and resurrection with Christ in baptism, as found in Rom. 6: 3 and Col. 2: 12. That these really are allusions to the customary practice of immersion, I, of course, do not doubt. But though they thus attach a beautiful spiritual significance to the usual mode of administering baptism, it by no means follows that this is the primary significance of the rite. On the contrary, the more numerous passages of the more numerous authors plainly give it the meaning of ablution. Thus: John 3: 25, "Then there arose a question between some of John's disciples and the Jews about purifying. And they came to John, and said unto him, Rabbi, he that was with thee beyond Jordan, to whom thou barest witness, behold, the same baptizeth, and all men come unto him."

Acts 22: 16, "And now why tarriest thou? Arise and be baptized, and wash away thy sins, calling on the name of the Lord."

Eph. 5: 26, "That He might sanctify and cleanse it with the washing of water by the word." The application of this to Baptism is denied by many, but apparently through an overstrained spiritualism. De Wette—than whom there cannot well be higher authority—refers it to Baptism, as well as the next, which is Titus 3: 5, "Not by works of righteousness which we have done, but according to his mercy He saved us, by

the washing of regeneration, and renewing of the Holy Ghost." In both these texts "washing" is more properly "bath."

Heb. 10: 22, "Let us draw near with a true heart in full assurance of faith, having our hearts sprinkled from an evil conscience, and our bodies washed with pure water." This, as De Wette says, though it includes more than Baptism, undoubtedly includes that.

1 Peter 3: 21, "The like figure whereunto even baptism doth also now save us (not the putting away of the filth of the flesh, but the answer of a good conscience toward God) by the resurrection of Jesus Christ." Here ablution is expressly named as the outward form of the rite.

Ablution, therefore, appears as the reigning signification of Baptism in the New Testament, while the idea of Burial appears as a beautiful secondary-suggestion, derived from the usual mode of its administration.

With this the antecedent history of the rite is in agreement. It did not originate in the Christian Church, but passed into it from the previous baptism of John. Now his baptism was the baptism of repentance, symbolizing, on the very face of it, the washing away of sin. There is no reason to refer the form of it to the mystery of Christ's death. This was not yet revealed, and nevertheless there is among the Jews no expression of surprise at the form of his baptism. They ask John: "Why baptizest thou?" but not: "What does this new rite mean?" Their question implies familiarity with Baptism, as a purificatory rite, but doubt as to John's authority to administer it. Indeed, if they did not already know baptism, from whence have they derived their proselyte baptism, which also is or once was a complete immersion? We cannot well suppose that they borrowed it from the hated Christians. And immersion with them cannot have referred to burial with Christ.

Baptism, in fact, is simply a concentration of the purificatory washings of the Law. None of these, as we know, were necessarily immersions, yet in Hebrews 9: 10 they are, in the Greek,

all called Baptisms, showing that the word was already applied to all forms of religious ablution.

Purification by washing, indeed, answering to the sense of defilement, as sacrifice does to the sense of guilt, has prevailed in almost all religions, true or false. To throw aside these evident and deeply rooted analogies, confirmed, moreover, by express New Testament authority, seems to imply third-party zeal, seeing only the points that make for its own position, and neglecting many more, and those much stronger ones, on the other side.

Allowing, however, that Baptism is only a *ceremonial ablution*, is it legitimate to administer it otherwise than by Immersion? The chief arguments for the exclusive legitimacy of this mode are the following, which I do not name in the order of their relative importance, but of convenience. It is contended,—

(1) That Immersion has the advantage of superior expressiveness.

(2) That it is enforced by the authority of our Lord.

(3) That $\betaαπτίζω$ means that, and nothing else.

The latter assertion can hardly be maintained in view of Heb. 9: 10. However, Dr. Edward Beecher's book appears convincing on that point. So, referring to that, I will examine the first argument.

Immersion is undoubtedly, in itself, the most expressive form of baptism. This alone sets it fully forth as what it properly is, something that marks the great spiritual epoch of Regeneration. But a rite by becoming less expressive does not thereby cease to be the same rite. As the scattered and partial washings of the law were in baptism by immersion gathered up into the one great "Bath of Regeneration," so, starting from this, lesser ablutions, though less expressively significant, have still the same significance. Now needlessly to diminish the expressiveness of a ceremony, is reprehensible; but it is widely different from destroying its essence. If purification is the meaning of Baptism, then it should appear that ablution, in any form,

contains its essence, unless, indeed, it be expressly restricted to that one mode, which I shall presently consider.

Now, while undoubtedly the most expressive form of a rite meant to be used but once, ought to be employed, unless there is some strong reason to the contrary, the use of a less expressive form is not, of itself, a sufficient reason for repeating it in the fuller one. Supposing that I regard the Episcopalian rite of marriage as the most perfect, or, on the other hand, the Quaker rite (and each is singularly beautiful in its way), I am by no means thereby justified, if I find a couple have not been married by my favorite rite, in remarrying them, if they have been united by some rite that implies the essence of the matrimonial covenant.

But waiving now the question of propriety, we have before us the vital question of divine authority. If our Lord, in His last command, used a term equivalent to *βαπτίζω*, and if *βαπτίζω* signifies only to *immerse*, how can we conclude otherwise than that Jesus has expressly limited Christian baptism to this one mode?

This argument would have more weight if our Lord had been instituting a new rite, and in naming it had for the first time appropriated a previously secular word to a religious use. But seeing Christ did no such thing, seeing he simply transferred into the service of His Church an already existing rite, just as He found it, under the same name and the same form, I cannot see that his authority can be introduced as a new element into the question. Our Lord, in commanding His people to diffuse the new dispensation of the Spirit over the earth, has not descended to the level of a Levitical lawgiver, minutely prescribing every circumstance of an outward ceremony. He has simply consecrated to a new application an expression of discipleship already in use, without stopping to make a single remark, or a single change in the rite itself. Unless, therefore, immersion were previously essential to the rite, it would not be so in consequence of any precept of Christ. The rite, in the Church, has a new application but all questions respecting its form remain as they were before.

Now if Immersion were of the essence of Baptism, as existing at the time when it was taken up by Christ, it must be because (1) *βαπτίζω* had no other meaning than to *immerse*, and (2) because this meaning designated the very essence of the rite.

As to the first assumption, referring to the treatment of it in Dr. Edward Beecher's book, and conceding for the present, that *βαπτίζω* means only "to dip," I by no means see that this indicates Immersion to be an essential element of Baptism. Let me explain my meaning by reference to the other sacrament. The Lord's Supper is twice in the Acts denoted by the technical term "to break bread." If we suppose now that in this way, as might easily have happened, the Greek compound term "Artoklasm" had become a settled designation of the Lord's Supper, then the very name of the rite would have included the mention of Bread. But the churches of the Sandwich Islands, not having bread, formerly used taro root. They did not feel bound to defer the celebration of Christ's redeeming love until a ship could bring them bread from half round the world, and perhaps be wrecked on the way. But if Artoklasm, literally signifying the Breaking of Bread, had been the name of the rite, they would have retained it though breaking no bread. A technical word may deviate into a new application, without becoming untruthful, although good proof must be offered that the technical name does not include the very essence of the thing. This I have endeavored to do above. Language is full of these deviations. The common name of the Eucharist, namely, the Lord's Supper, is a proof that a sacrament may have a name which includes a non-essential circumstance. The first communion was celebrated at night; but we feel free to celebrate it in the morning. Yet we are accustomed still to call it the Lord's Supper. Allowing then,—what Dr. Beecher shows not to be the case, and what Hebrews ix: 10 shows not to be the case—that Baptism always means immersion, it does not follow that if we change the mode, we are bound to change the name. Baptism, in this

view, expresses the essence of the rite, namely, Religious Ablution, and a subordinate circumstance of the rite, namely, ablution by plunging. It would therefore be lawful to obtain a name that had become technical, even if the subordinate circumstance were neglected.

Immersion, in the baptism of adults, I regard as certainly the most expressive mode. And though personally much attached to Infant Baptism, I listen with profound deference to the Pedobaptist, Richard Rothe, when he urges as an argument of some force against it that infants cannot well be immersed. Yet there appear to be many circumstances in which higher interests dictate a departure from this mode of administration. And once regarding it not as a question of absolute command, but of greater or less perfection of form, we should not, even if we abstractly preferred it, necessarily feel bound to insist upon it. In reference to a question of subordinate rank, as I have endeavored to show this to be, considerations of Christian prudence and Christian unity may well be allowed a controlling force. And if we, by disusing immersion, have diminished the expressiveness of Baptism, the Baptists, in their over-zealousness for it, have incurred the danger of losing the ordinance altogether. If any circumstance is essential to the Christian ablution, we should suppose it to be the purity of the water, that, as Scripture directs, our bodies should be washed with "pure waters." But many, I might perhaps say most, of the Baptists, in their zeal for the *mode*, have so completely lost sight of the substance, as often to deny that the rite refers to ablution at all, and accordingly they will frequently baptize in the most thick and muddy water. Now surely a little clean water is better than a great deal of dirty water. A very scrupulous ritual conscience might well hesitate to acknowledge the baptism of a great many Baptists.

There are considerations lying back of the minute and mousing criticism which is often invoked as the arbiter of this dispute. Not that I would disparage verbal criticism: I am well aware that questions of much greater moment than the

mode of baptism are often assisted, though seldom decided, by it. Still, in the Church of Christ, questions of ceremonial usage ought to be regulated by a continual remembrance of the true nature of the Gospel. We are hardly led to expect that a religion for all countries and circumstances would be encumbered with a ritual of Levitical inflexibility. Doubtless we are bound to maintain its few ceremonies in their essential identity, nor wantonly, in lesser circumstances, to depart from primitive usage. It is, however, to be expected that, in the free development of the Church, diversities of usage should arise, which, being neither commanded nor forbidden by the Scriptures, may well enough be discussed, but ought not to be made occasions of division or of uneasy scruples. Indeed, even in more important matters than the form of a ceremony, minute and worrying scruples are no sign of moral health. In the New Testament we do not find a tone of painful scrupulosity. Ceremonial questions can hardly be said to occur in it, so completely are they swallowed up and absorbed in moral and spiritual ones. I cannot recall a New Testament allusion to a properly ritual controversy, except to discourage it. This certainly is not a reason why we should not come to a persuasion upon such points; but it is a warning to us that we ought not to determine questions of the New Economy upon principles borrowed from the Old.

These are the reasons why I do not now regard Immersion, though primitive and expressive, as the only legitimate form of Christian Baptism. It is well to settle down upon a persuasion on one side or the other, and there really does not seem to be substance enough in the question to render it important that we should make any great stir about it on either side. An eminent French Protestant lately visited Scotland, and in scorn of their exaggerated ecclesiastical disputes said: " You here in Scotland are quarrelling over the question whether organs ought to be used in churches: we in France over the question whether there is a God." To establish ourselves in the faith of the Incarnate God by receiving the fulness of His Spirit; to

cleanse hypocrisy, rapacity, dishonesty, oppressiveness, pride of wealth, pride of knowledge, unhelpful selfishness, and hidden murderousness out of His sanctuary ; to strengthen ourselves and our brethren against the danger of being brought to worship some atheistic idol of unconscious law in the very temple of the Living God ; to guard ourselves against the lying wonders and the false prophets that are filling the world ; to make known the name of the Son of God throughout that earth for which He has died, and over which He is yet to reign ; to assist in disentangling His vital and essential truth from its almost hopeless implication with the fallacies of men ; to live as those to whom the consciousness of eternal life begun makes the possessions of earth sit loose, and who in otherwise than vague and empty phrase look for the full solution of the perplexities of earth in the coming of the Lord from heaven, is too great a work to leave much time for the mere fringes of Christian duty.

X.

CHRISTIANITY IN OLD JAPAN.

BY REV. T. ROMEYN BECK, D.D.

THE form of Christianity first introduced into Japan was Roman Catholicism. In 1542, Mendez Pinto, the Portuguese navigator, more fortunate than Columbus, discovered Zipangu, and made his discovery known to Europe. As usual, the missionary followed close in the track of the discoverer. Francis Xavier, the Jesuit, friend and follower of Loyola, landed at Kagoshima, in Satsuma, the southern province of Kiushiu, seven years later. He was accompanied by his disciple, Anjiro, a native of that province, converted at Malacca, after leaving Goa, and two other Jesuit priests. From Satsuma he traveled north through Bungo, crossed into Hondo, and made his headquarters in the "Kingdom of Amanguzium," Yamaguchi, in the province of Suwo. Everywhere he preached the Gospel with intense earnestness in the face of great obstacles, not the least being ignorance of the language and the poverty of his dress and surroundings. After a stay of two years (1549-1551), he left the field, though by his Christian spirit and devotion to his work meriting the title "Apostle of Japan." Later the seed sown by this great and good man sprang up into a plentiful harvest.

The form of Xavier looms up grandly among the pioneers of the Gospel in those early days of Jesuitism. His personal history is typical and full of interest. Of a noble Navarrese family, at the age of twenty he was appointed to the Chair of Philosophy in the College de Beauvais. Among his pupils was Ignatius Loyola, who had already conceived the idea of the

Order of which he afterwards became the head. The scholar gained such influence over the teacher that Xavier abandoned the prospects of scholastic fame, resigned his professorship, and entered heart and soul into the schemes of his friend. The Order of Jesus was founded in 1540 by a bull of Pope Paul III. Soon after, fired with religious zeal, choosing a life of privation and hardship, Xavier, leaving home and friends, sailed from Lisbon to India and the Far East. His success at Goa, the capital of Portuguese India, was phenomenal. Thence he journeyed to Malacca and later to Japan. Soon after leaving this country he was seized with fever, the result of long exposure, and died, solitary and alone, deserted even by the ship's company, on a little island near Macao, at the age of 46.

The period of the introduction, growth and downfall of Christianity in Japan synchronizes with many wonderful events in Europe. It was one of those epochs in the world's history when the human mind overleaps the barriers of time and space, like some mighty torrent—epochs when God's "increasing purpose" is most clearly seen. The capture of Constantinople and the victorious career of the "unspeakable Turk," strangely enough, mark the breaking up of the Middle Ages and the dawn of the Renaissance. Learned Greeks were scattered throughout Italy and the Levant; famous universities were founded; the chairs of literature and science were filled with able teachers; the young men, always the first to come into touch with the spirit of the age, and to stand in the vanguard of progress, flocked by thousands to the great seats of learning. A spirit of enterprise and adventure such as the world has not seen before or since, awoke. The mariner's compass was improved and adapted to long voyages. Spain and Portugal, in the south of Europe, the Netherlands and England, in the north, led the nations. America was discovered. The art of printing with metal types was invented. The fine arts revived and flourished; Da Vinci, Raphael, Michael Angelo, Corregio painted. The pen of Cervantes, with its pungent satire, gave the finishing stroke to chivalry and knight-errantry, with their

train of absurdities. Dante Alighieri, in his immortal poems, two centuries before, had preluded, in the soft Italian, the coming doom of the degenerate Papacy, which the stern German monk, Martin Luther, was in this age, in some measure, to make real.

While these great events were taking place in Europe, Japan was in the throes of revolution. By a strange coincidence, the latter half of the sixteenth century was characterized by the most important social and political changes in her history. The wars of the clans, that had lasted, with little intermission, for five centuries, from the days of Toba Tennō, the seventy-fourth Mikado, were brought to an end. Feudalism was consolidated and systematized. The line of the Tokugawa Shoguns—the Augustan age of Old Japan—was established contemporaneously with the accession of the House of Stuart in England. This is not the place for even a hasty sketch of the political history of Japan. We are concerned at present only with the religious phase.

Three of the greatest men Japan has produced were chief actors in the Christian drama. These were Nobunaga, Hideyoshi and Ieyasu. Of this famous trio the first favored, the last two persecuted Christianity.

Ota Nobunaga's work (1568-82) was constructive, that of a peacemaker. Under the weak Ashikaga Shoguns, who had held power for two centuries and a half, the people had been greatly oppressed and impoverished. Powerful Daimios carried on constant war with one another. The Mikado, shut up in his palace at Kyōtō, and to be seen only by his court ladies and the higher kuge or nobles, was a mere puppet in the hands of unscrupulous Shoguns. Nobunaga deposed Yoshiaki, the last of the Ashikaga line, overawed the daimios and secured control of a number of rich fiefs,—thus beginning the consolidation and centralization of power completed by Ieyasu,—administering the government in the name of the Mikado, though himself the power behind the throne. Finding the Buddhist priesthood an obstacle to the successful execution of his plans by their im-

moral lives, indifference to the religious wants of the common people and servility to the powerful lords, he subjected them to a bitter persecution, slaying many and destroying their monasteries. Finding the Jesuits, on the other hand, kind to the poor, engrossed in their Christian work and living abstemious lives, he treated them with favor. This he did not from belief in their doctrines, but simply as a measure of state policy. Many churches were built and many natives converted, the number of adherents reaching, it is said, 150,000 in Kiushiu, Shikoku and Southern Hondo. Nay, such was the favor that Christianity found among the rich and powerful that the very year of Nobunaga's death an embassy was sent by the Christian Daimios of Bungo, Omura and Arima to Rome and Madrid to kiss the toe of Pope Gregory XIII. and pay their respects to Philip II.

Toyotomi Hideyoshi, the friend and retainer of Nobunaga, reversed the policy of his predecessor toward the Christians. He saw or thought he saw in the Jesuits designs inimical to the independence of Japan. In 1587, five years after his accession to power, a decree was published commanding the foreign missionaries to quit the country within twenty days. Persecutions soon broke out against the native Christians. In 1597 three Portuguese Jesuits, six Spanish Franciscans and seventeen native Christians were put to death at Nagasaki.

Hideyoshi died in 1598, and was succeeded by Tokugawa Ieyasu, the organizer and legislator,—Justinian of Japan. During his administration and those of his son and grandson, Hidetada and Ieyemitsu, Christianity was persecuted and finally extirpated. The number of Christians in the first years of Ieyasu amounted to 600,000. This able Shogun seems to have been disposed at first to tolerate Christianity, in conformity to his mild character and policy. Presently, however, owing to many influences, one of which was the representations of the Dutch, who, at this time, came to Japan to establish commercial relations, and soon afterwards for the sake of the profitable Japanese trade which they succeeded in monopolizing, con-

sented to be pigeon-holed in Deshima, a little plot of ground 600 by 200 feet in the bay of Nagasaki,—he was led to enforce the old decrees and issue new ones. Under these the Christians were destroyed in every form savage cruelty could invent, nearly always meeting death with heroic constancy. The records of these times vividly recall similar scenes enacted under the Roman emperors. Says one account, "We read of Christians being executed in a barbarous manner in sight of each other, of their being buried alive, of their being torn asunder by oxen, of their being tied up in rice bags which were heaped up together and the piles thus formed set on fire. Others were tortured before death by insertion of sharp spikes under the nails of their hands and feet, while some poor wretches by a refinement of horrid cruelty were shut up in cages and thus left to starve with food before their eyes."

The bloody tragedy was closed by what is known in history as the "Massacre of Shimabara,"—a town in the province of Hizen, Kiushiu, to which the Christian peasants had fled in desperation and seized the castle, raising the standard of revolt against their persecutors. The castle was taken and a wholesale slaughter ensued, 30,000 perishing. In the entrance to the harbor of Nagasaki stands a little wooded island with a steep cliff rising sheer out of the sea. From the top of this cliff thousands of Christians, the last remnant of Christianity in Old Japan, captured in the siege of Arima (1677), were hurled into the deep.

These later annals carry us back in thought to the massacres of Protestants in Piedmont happening about the same time and earlier. Here, in Europe, such are the strange compensations of history, the Church persecuted in Japan becomes the persecutor. Do not the groans and shrieks from the rock of Pappenberg seem like bloody answers to the prayer of Milton :

"Avenge, O Lord, Thy slaughtered saints,
Whose bones lie scattered upon Alpine mountains cold;
E'en those who kept Thy truth so pure of old,
When all our fathers worshiped stocks and stones."

The length of this article forbids us to consider many interesting questions. Two or three remarks, however, must be made, results of some historical study and personal intercourse of six years.

1. The spread of Christianity among the Japanese was very rapid, bringing to mind the triumphs of the Gospel in Europe in the first centuries. Dr. Rein in his exhaustive work on Japan assigns as causes—the degeneracy of Buddhism in the last days of the Ashinagas; the moral lives and zealous propagandism of the Jesuits; the social misery of the common people inclining them to embrace a religion which offered supreme happiness in the future state; the similarity of Roman Catholic rites and ceremonies to those of Buddhism, their ancient faith; and last, the eagerness of the Shoguns and leading Diamos to introduce European civilization of which Pinto had brought gunpowder and firearms as the first fruits. Doubtless the last exerted the greatest influence, inducing many of the leaders to seek to change the policy of seclusion and favor the presence of foreigners, regarded as bringers of material benefits. The situation was remarkably like that which preceded the entrance of Protestant missions into Japan in recent days, and which has followed them with public favor down to the late re-action. Then as now the intelligent classes cared very little for religion in itself, but very much for its accompaniments, education and physical conveniences. The typical Japanese is governed by the head, not the heart, as Count Nonoura, once naively remarked to the writer in conversation about Protestant Christianity.

2. Has that strange passage in Japanese history left no trace upon the people? Has this hundred years (1549-1677) of zealous Christian labor at whose head stands the noble figure of Xavier,—this sincere, if in many aspects mistaken propagandism,—these holocausts of inoffensive victims left no impression, passed away as completely as the old Etruscans of Italy? There seems to be a consensus among foreign writers that such is the case. It may be so. But apart from the fact

that descendants of old Romish converts have been found in our day here and there—notably at Urakami, a village near Nagasaki, where to the great surprise of the Japanese government a large congregation of Roman Catholic Christians was found in 1868,—we do not know what influence this Christian episode may have had on their national life. Somewhere in family records or in the annals of obscure villages and distant provinces, or in folk lore—that repository of the odds and ends of history,—may linger reminiscences of those times, still forming an active though, perhaps, insignificant factor in Japanese life. It must not be forgotten that Japanese civilization is an unsolved problem. After forty years of study and investigation since the days of Perry, after the legion of books that have been and are being written on Japan, the modes of thought, the secret springs of action, in short the genius of the people, which is reflected in national history, is an unknown quantity. The difficulty of the language in which their written and printed records are contained is one cause—the number of foreigners who have thoroughly mastered the Japanese dialect may almost be counted on the fingers. But the chief cause is the peculiar structure of the Japanese mind which conceives and formulates conceptions in a manner totally different from or even contrary to the Occidental. It is easy to trace the line of Mikados, of the successive Shogunates and their acts, to lay the finger on this element of civilization or on that,—just as it is easy to analyze the stamens and pistil and petals of the flower, but to give a notion of the delicate aroma in the one case or to catch the subtle spirit of the people in the other,—*hic labor, hoc opus est.*

3. The history of Christianity in Old Japan contains a warning for modern missions. Our Lord proclaimed the watchword of the Gospel when He said, “My kingdom is not of this world.” Romanism showed herself an apostate church when she ignored this watchword and assumed temporal sovereignty. Jesuitism in Japan played the same rôle, interfering in affairs of State and aiming ultimately to bring the Japanese under

papal control. The astute Shoguns soon perceived this, and the persecutions were the natural result. * Hideyoshi and his successors had no fault to find with the religious and ethical aspects of Christianity—worship of the true God, kindness and charity to the poor—their quarrel was with its political propensities. But for this, the Christians would, doubtless, have been unmolested and Japan might have been Roman Catholic to-day.

XI.

NOTICES OF NEW BOOKS.

THE EXHAUSTIVE CONCORDANCE OF THE BIBLE. Showing every word of the text of the Common English Version of the Canonical Books, and every occurrence of each word in regular order, together with a comparative concordance of the Authorized and Revised Versions, including the American Variations; also brief Dictionaries of the Hebrew and Greek Words of the Original, with Reference to the English Words. By James Strong, S.T.D., LL.D. New York: Hunt & Eaton. Cincinnati: Cranston & Curtis, 1894. Price, \$6.00.

We have examined this work with considerable care, and have found it not only very satisfactory, but also very interesting and instructive. Its merits are such, indeed, that it leaves little room for further improvement. Of all the Concordances of the Holy Scriptures that have as yet been published it is, in our opinion, the very best, and should have a place on every minister's study table. It is, as it claims to be, truly exhaustive. Every word found in the Authorized and Revised Versions of the Canonical Scriptures is to be found in it, and every occurrence of each word is given in regular order. If any word in any passage of Scripture therefore is certainly known, the place where the passage occurs can readily be found. In this respect it is absolutely complete and surpasses every other concordance in our language. The Comparative Concordance of the Authorized and Revised Versions which it contains also enables the reader to study the two versions in the most thorough and satisfactory manner, and to judge understandingly of their respective merits. By means of the brief Dictionaries of the Hebrew and Greek words of the Original Scriptures, and a simple system of reference numbers, moreover, any reader, whether scholar or otherwise, is enabled to ascertain not only the Hebrew, Chaldee or Greek Word of which any significant word in the ordinary English Version is the translation, but likewise the exact form, precise pronunciation, and various meanings, both essential and derived, of the Hebrew, Chaldee or Greek word. He can also at a glance tell whether the English word in the various places in which it is used stands for the same word in the original, or for different words. It thus puts within the reach of every one who possesses it, the means of making a very thorough study of any portion of Scripture that may claim his attention.

THE HOLMAN NEW SELF-PRONOUNCING SUNDAY-SCHOOL TEACHERS' BIBLE, CONTAINING THE OLD AND NEW TESTAMENTS. Translated out of the Original Tongues : and with the former translations diligently compared and revised. The text conformable to that of the Oxford Bible, printed at the University Press, Oxford. Bourgeois, 8 vo., refs. Philadelphia: A. J. Holman & Co., Ltd. 1894.

Of the various Sunday-school Teachers' Bibles now before the public, we consider this by far the most desirable. Its merits are many. Its size is convenient, and its general appearance attractive. It is printed on thin yet strong paper, and in large, clear type which is very easily read and very grateful to the eye. Every proper name in the text, moreover, is syllabified and accented, and the many variable vowels and consonants are diacritically marked according to the most reliable modern standards of pronunciation. As there are very few persons who can at sight correctly pronounce all the proper names in the Bible, this will be found a great help by most persons in reading aloud the Scriptures. In addition to the text of the Old and New Testaments, this edition also contains newly prepared "Illustrated Aids and Helps," which give a vast amount of important information on biblical subjects, which will prove very helpful to teachers generally. These "Aids and Helps" are substantially the same as those found in the latest edition of the Oxford Bible, and therefore fully up to the present state of biblical knowledge. We heartily commend the work to all our readers, and feel sure that all who purchase it will be greatly pleased with it.

THE SECOND BOOK OF KINGS. By F. W. Farrar, D.D., F.R.S., late Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge ; Archdeacon of Westminster. New York: A. C. Armstrong & Son, 51 East Tenth Street. 1894. Price, \$1.50.

THE EPISTLE OF ST. PAUL TO THE ROMANS. By Handley C. G. Moule, M.A., Principal of Ridley Hall, Cambridge. New York: A. C. Armstrong & Son, 51 East Tenth Street. 1894. Price, \$1.50.

Both these volumes belong to the series known as "The Expositor's Bible." They are also both works of superior merit, and will prove a valuable addition to any library. In our opinion they are to be classed among the best volumes of the series.

Dr. Farrar is always brilliant and readable. In his exposition of the Second Book of Kings there is, consequently, nothing dull, tedious or inane. On the contrary, he brings out the historical incidents of the book in a most interesting and striking manner. His work throughout reads like a stirring romance. All may not be able to agree with him in his interpretation of certain portions of the inspired record, but all must be impressed with his reverent treatment of it, and with the scholarly manner in which he presents his views concerning it. The point of view which, to a great extent, colors the entire exposition is that of the follow-

ing words of the Bishop of Derry, with which Dr. Farrar prefaces his work: "Theories of inspiration which impaginate the everlasting Spirit, and make each verse a cluster of objectless and mechanical miracles, are not seriously believed by any one; the Bible itself abides in its endless power and unexhausted truth. All that is not asbestos is being burned away by the restless fires of thought and criticism. That which remains is enough, and it is indestructible."

Of the Epistles of St. Paul, that to the Romans is the most important and most systematic. It may, therefore, properly be called the Apostle's masterpiece. Of this Epistle Principal Moule's exposition is a fitting one. It is, also, in our opinion, a masterpiece. For clear apprehension of the Apostle's meaning and for eloquent setting forth of his teaching, it is unequalled by any other work with which we are acquainted. No one, we think, can read it without being deeply moved by the great truths which the Apostle proclaimed, and without feeling thankful to the author for making these truths so clear and impressive.

THE GOSPEL OF ST. MATTHEW. By Alexander Maclaren, D.D. In two volumes. New York: A. C. Armstrong & Son. 1894. Price, \$1.00 per volume.

THE GOSPEL OF ST. MARK. By Alexander Maclaren, D.D. New York: A. C. Armstrong & Son. 1894. Price, \$1.00.

THE GOSPEL OF ST. LUKE. By Alexander Maclaren, D.D. New York: A. C. Armstrong & Son. 1894. Price, \$1.00.

THE GOSPEL OF ST. JOHN. By Alexander Maclaren, D.D. New York: A. C. Armstrong & Son, 51 East Tenth Street, near Broadway. 1894. Price, \$1.00.

These volumes belong to a new and important series of works by Dr. Maclaren, designated "Bible Class Expositions," and they are specially intended for the instruction of teachers and scholars in Sunday-Schools and Bible Classes. They are made up of the expositions of the International Sunday-School Lessons originally prepared for the *Sunday-School Times*, from which they are reprinted with the concurrence of the proprietors. All these expositions are marked by the characteristic clearness and force for which their author is noted, and are rich with instructive and impressive thought. They are, indeed, in every respect models of Scripture exposition, and deserve to be studied as such by all whose office it is to make known the Word of God as given to men in the Holy Scriptures. All classes of persons will find them profitable reading, and a careful study of these volumes especially cannot but give clearer views of Christ and His teachings.

WAS THE APOSTLE PETER EVER AT ROME? A Critical Examination of the Evidence and Arguments presented on Both Sides of the Question. By Rev. Mason Gallagher, D. D., Author of "True Churchmanship Vindicated," "The Duty and Necessity of Revision," "A Chapter of Unwritten History," "The True Historic Episcopate." Introduction by Rev. John Hall, D. D., Pastor Fifth Avenue Presbyterian Church, New York. New York: Printed by Hunt & Eaton, 150 Fifth Avenue. 1894. Price, \$1.00

The question discussed in this volume is an old one. Different answers have been given to it in the past, and no doubt will be given to it in the future, as there is no evidence by which it can with absolute certainty be determined. Nothing, we are disposed to think, depends on the answer given one way or another. If St. Peter was at Rome this does not necessarily establish the doctrine of the Papacy, nor does his not having been there necessarily disprove it. For our part we believe the weight of the testimony is in favor of his having been there. Dr. Gallagher, however, thinks otherwise. Those who desire to know what can be said on his side of the question will find his book a valuable one. It is well written and considers the subject in a calm and judicial manner.

PAUL'S LETTER TO THE COLOSSIANS. Written A.D. 63. Transcribed by J. M. Pascoe, B.D., Member of Pittsburg Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church. New York: Hunt & Eaton, Cincinnati; Cranston & Curtis. 1894. Price, 20 cents.

This is a booklet of forty-six pages, and belongs to "The Book of Books Series." It is made up of two parts. The first part consists of the Epistle to the Colossians freely rendered into modern English. The second part consists of Notes on the Epistle. The transcript was awarded the prize offered by Chancellor W. F. McDowell, Ph.D., of the University of Denver, Colorado, for the best version of Colossians, re-written, not re-translated, in modern language and style. The Notes have since been added by the author. They are judicious and instructive. Both the transcript and notes will repay study.

THE DISEASES OF THE WILL. By Th. Ribot, Professor of Comparative and Experimental Psychology in the College of France. Authorized Translation from the Eighth French Edition by Merwin-Marie Snell. Chicago: The Open Court Publishing Company. 1894. Price, 75 cents.

This is an important treatise, and deserves the attention of all who are interested in Psychological study. The subject of it is in itself a most interesting one, and the treatment of it is very able. In his own line of study Prof. Ribot has few, if any equals, and therefore is always instructive. No one, we feel assured, can read the short monograph before us without gathering something of value from it.